REPORT RESUMES

ED 011 275

UD 002 461

DEMONSTRATION AND TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

BY- HARTLEY, RUTH E.
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE 31 AUG 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$6.16 154P.

DESCRIPTORS- PRIVATE SCHOOLS, PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *SPECIAL PROGRAMS, *TEACHER EDUCATION, *EVALUATION, HEALTH EDUCATION, LIBRARY SERVICES, SPEECH EDUCATION, MUSIC EDUCATION, ART EDUCATION, EVALUATION TECHNIQUES, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, NEW YORK CITY, ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

AN INTERIM EVALUATION WAS MADE OF A DEMONSTRATION AND TRAINING PROJECT FOR NONPUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS OF THE DISADVANTAGED. THE PROJECT OFFERED TRAINING IN MUSIC, ART, HEALTH EDUCATION, LIBRARY PROCEDURES, AND SPEECH IMPROVEMENT TO THESE TEACHERS BY MEANS OF WEEKDAY, SATURDAY, AND SUMMER INSTITUTES AND THROUGH INTERSCHOOL VISITS. DATA FOR THE EVALUATION WERE GATHERED BY MONITORING SELECTED SESSIONS AND THROUGH INTERVIEWS AND QUESTIONNAIRES. ALL THE PROGRAMS LACKED ADEQUATE INTRA- AND INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION ABOUT THE PARTICIPANTS' PREVIOUS TRAINING, THEIR SPECIAL NEEDS, AND THEIR TEACHING SITUATIONS. ANNOUNCEMENTS, RECRUITMENTS, AND SELECTION PROCEDURES WERE INEFFECTIVE, AND SUFFERED FROM POOR RECORD KEEPING AND FEEDBACK. VARIOUS FORMS USED IN THE EVALUATION AND THE RATINGS OF THE SESSIONS IN EACH OF THE SUBJECT AREAS ARE INCLUDED. (NH)

ED011275

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Educational Practices Division
Nathan Brown, Associate Director

Evaluation of New York City School District educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) - performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1965-66 School Year.

Joseph Krevisky
Research Coordinator, Title I Projects

DEMONSTRATION AND TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Dr. Ruth E. Hartley
Research Director

152 p.

August 31, 1966

UD 002461

12

UD 002461

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE
Nature and Description of the Program. 1

Objectives of the Evaluation 7
Methods and Data 8
Health Education 16
Library Services 17
Music 18
Art 20
Speech Improvement 20

Findings: Health Education 22
Content and Extent of Program 22
Evaluation by Consultants 23
Summary Statements 25
Evaluation by Participants - Assessment by Rating 26
Changes and Additions Desired 32
Most Useful Items 33

Findings: Library Services 35
Content of the Workshop 35
Skills Developed in the Workshop 39
Evaluation by Participants 43
Changes and Additions Desired 46
Most Useful Items 47

Findings: Music. 52
Content and Extent of Program 52
Evaluation by Consultants 52
Organization and Presentation 63
Evaluation by Participants 72
Changes and Additions Desired 76
Most Useful Items 77

Findings: Art 78
Content and Extent of Program 78
Evaluation by Consultants 79
Drawing 79
Success in Meeting Apparent Objectives 81
Comments and Other Observations 81
Designing and Constructing with Paper 82
Stitchery, Puppetry, Paper Mache 86
Assessment by Ratings 93
Changes and Additions Desired 95
Most Useful Items 96

Findings: Speech 99
One-Day Institutes 99
May - June Program 99
July Program 100
Changes and Additions Desired. 115
Most Useful Items. 116

General Recommendations 120

DEMONSTRATION AND TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS:

Art Music Physical Education, Library Services, and Speech Improvement

Nature and Description of the Program:

The nature of the program is best indicated by the following excerpts from the official project description: "The disadvantaged child has long been the concern of the public school teacher and has entered the non-public school fairly recently. The non-public school teacher can benefit from teacher training activities conducted by qualified specialists who have developed needed skills with these children. The current project hopes to provide such opportunities by offering demonstration teacher services for the purpose of training teachers in non-public schools. Teacher training will be offered in the following fields: music, art, health education, library and speech improvement. The selected schools included in this project are in attendance areas having high concentration of low income families. Each school enrolls many disadvantaged children who require specialized services."

Objectives of, procedures and facilities for the project are also best delineated in the words of the project description:

Teacher Training in Music:

"This program will concentrate on offering teachers of the non-public schools a greater background in music skills, additional teaching techniques, and innovations in content.

1. There will be three-day institutes (weekdays), Saturday institutes and Summer institutes.
2. There will be inter-visitation programs in which non-public school teachers will visit public schools to see music teachers in action.
3. There will be Summer elementary schools operating so that actual demonostrations of classroom teaching can be observed.

Teacher Training in Art:

"The major objectives will be to increase the skills and effectiveness of non-public school teachers in the following techniques:

a. the promotion of children's understanding, awareness and appreciation of beauty, art forms and aesthetic qualities in spite of the handicaps in these areas associated with living in a socio-economically disadvantaged environment.

b. The development of children's visual perception and appreciation of color, proportion, design and texture.

c. the development of children's skills in the use of various materials, tools and processes through the provision of art experiences in a variety of media so that they may be helped to release their creative urges through individual experimentation with various art materials.

d. enhancement of children's powers to think independently and creatively and to communicate their thoughts and feelings through art.

e. the stimulation of children's reading about art and artists."

"There will be workshops for non-public school teachers conducted by licensed supervisors of art instruction or by specially qualified and licensed teachers of art conducted in various non-public schools.

Some parochial schools, notably Hebrew ones, by extending the school day from 3:30 to 5:30, will be able to avail themselves of demonostration lessons given by public school licensed supervisors and teachers of art."

Teacher Training in Health Education:

"The two areas of health education which are involved are Physical Education and Health Guidance.

In the area of Physical Education the Demonstration and Teacher Training Program of workshops would attempt to show teacher representatives from the private schools how to conduct physical fitness activities such as exercises, dances and games. Demonostrations will be given of the proper use of supplies (balls, bats, gloves, etc.) and of equipment (mats, parallel bars, horses, etc.)

Health guidance objectives are geared to familiarize and develop working competencies in participating teachers in the use of the audiometer, scale, stadiometer, eye charts, color vision tests and various health record forms................"

The District Health Counselor will be assigned to conduct three workshops in each of the five boroughs of the City for teacher representatives from the private day schools. These sessions will extend from 3:30 P.M. to 5:30 P.M.

Content of the workshops will consist of familiarizing the teachers with the kinds of equipment programs used in the City schools.

The Bureau for Health Education will furnish equipment and supplies based on pupil needs.

"The facilities to be used in the training and demonstration project will be those of the school or schools chosen as training centers for the courses instituted."

Teacher Training in Library:

"The non-public school teachers participating in this program will be helped to learn new skills and improve existing skills in the following areas:

a. the stimulation of extensive recreational and research reading in children.

b. the refinement of children's taste in reading.

c. the development of teacher ability to work with children in a school or classroom library setting.

d. story-telling.

e. knowledge of children's literature."

"Training and demonstration sessions for non-public school teachers will be given after 3:00 P.M. and on Saturdays by volunteer paid licensed Board of Education teachers of library. The sessions will be designed to help the non-public school teachers to stimulate interest, choose materials, tell stories, and conduct other classroom activities that will encourage extensive recreational and research reading by children and develop readiness for formal reading activities in young children."

"The facilities to be used in the training and demonstration project will be those of the school or schools chosen as training centers for the courses instituted."

Teacher Training in Speech Improvement:

"The aim here will be to help teachers in offering the following:

a. an organized, sequential program of direct instruction in the skills of listening and speaking for all pupils-

b. the development of pupil ability to use listening and speaking skills effectively in practical situations-

c. the provision of experiences for children in speech arts, in group discussions and oral reporting so as to further their self-expression and cultural enrichment."

Licensed public school supervisors and teachers of speech improvement will conduct one-day workshops on Saturday on "Oral Communication Problems of Disadvantaged Pupils." These will be held in the boroughs of Bronx, Manhattan, Brooklyn and Queens and about 100 non-public school teachers would be expected to attend teacher training institutes in Brooklyn. These will be held for duration of 10 weeks, once a week from 3:30 to 5:30. Guest lecturers prominent in the field will participate. Approximately 55 non-public school teachers will be expected to attend each institute.

The Department of Speech Improvement will also provide a Summer institute of two weeks duration which will meet for 30 hours from 9:00 to 12:00 daily. The central theme of the institute will be "Oral Communication Problems of Disadvantaged Pupils."

"For the conduct of workshops and institutes on centrally located school in each borough possessed of a good auditorium and nearby lunch facilities will be chosen."

"In all cases brief logs will be kept by the Board of Education training participants and leaders. The principals and teachers of the non-public schools will be requested to complete open-ended questionnaires."

Potential Extent of the Program:

Official records indicating the total number of schools eligible for participation in the Teacher Training project have not been available to the evaluation staff. From other sources, however, it appears that 156 schools, representing 126 Catholic, 21 Hebrew, 3 Greek Orthodox, 4 Lutheran and 2 Episcopalian administrations, were eligible.

OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION:

The objectives of this evaluation are to assess, by a combination of the best methods available to us, the extent to which program objectives were fulfilled during the 1965-1966 school year.

In accordance with the wording of the project description, this is to be considered an "interim" evaluation.

For several reasons, this must only be a partial evaluation, even within the limits of its "interim" status. Evaluation Teams were set in motion long after the start of the programs, thus having access for direct scrutiny to only a small segment of ongoing programs. In addition, because programs were given towards the end of the school year, and both time and budgetary consideration limited the activity of the evaluators, the impact of the programs in the classroom in direct involvement of the disadvantaged child for whose benefit they were offered, could not be included in this assessment.

Despite the unavoidable limitations of this assessment, however, efforts will be made to identify areas in which improvement is needed and to offer suggestions for implementing such improvement.

METHODS AND DATA

Data for this assessment were gathered by the following procedures:

1. Monitoring of available sessions in each training area by persons qualified by experience and training to judge their adequacy for two functions:
   as teaching-learning situations and as implementation of the stated program objectives.
2. Interviews with supervisory personnel who planned, coordinated or participated as instructors in the program.
3. Interviews with selected teacher-participants.
4. Major evaluation questionnaires sent to all teacher-participants for whom addresses were available.
5. Inspection of Board of Education attendance records.

Each consultant-observer has had advanced specialized professional training at a level close to or including the doctorate, and considerable experience in the educational application of his specialty. Except for one training area, monitoring was done by teams of consultants so that judgments of any given program were based on the considered opinions and ratings of several experts. Reports of sessions monitored were based on guidelines suggested in "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Each Session Monitored" (Appendix, Form I). Each consultant was furnished with a copy of that part of the project description which included the general objectives of the program and the specific objectives for each area. To enhance the vividness and validity of reports, photographs of selected sessions in progress were submitted with the verbal reports.

METHODS AND DATA

In addition to assessing the quality of selected sessions, consultant-observers also collected certain demographic and descriptive data about the participants and their school situations.
Most evaluation teams also submitted over-all evaluation reports for their respective areas, based on their observations and interviews. In some cases, several trained members submitted over-all evaluations and recommendations individually.

Interviews with Board of Education Program Coordinators and with Workshop directors were undertaken largely to obtain information about planning and processing the programs and about the contents of sessions that were not monitored because they occurred before the start of the evaluation.

During interviews with Coordinators answers to the following questions were sought:

1. When was the program instituted?
2. How were contents of program decided upon?
3. How was information about the program circulated?
4. How was eligibility of participants determined?
5. How many different programs were offered?
6. What were the contents of programs, by topic, outline or summary?
7. What was the total number of sessions offered?
8. What arrangements for feedback (from participants) were made to ensure relevance of training offered to teacher needs?

9. What was done (or is being done) to facilitate application of the training offered in the classroom?

Interviews with Workshop directors were guided, as far as possible by the following outline:

WORKSHOP DIRECTOR INTERVIEW

I. Organization:

1. Who is ultimately responsible for the organization and success of the workshop?
2. How much initiative were you given for organizing the presentation?
3. Were adequate instructions given to you? Were your responsibilities clearly defined?
4. Were there any problems in communicating with other persons involved?
5. Were adequate facilities and materials provided--quantity, quality, suitability?
6. Have you had sufficient help (secretarial, etc.) in preparing for the workshop?
7. What other organizational problems have arisen?
8. What changes in procedures, staff, or responsibilities would you recommend?

II. Objectives:

1. What were the objectives of the workshop?
2. Were guidelines for objectives given to you or was the formulation of objectives entirely your responsibility?
3. What was the basis for the objectives which were formed--personal experience, educational philosophy, a published set of objectives, etc.?
4. How were the objectives related to the Parochial schools?
5. How, specifically, were the objectives geared to the disadvantaged child?
6. Do you feel that the objectives were, in fact, covered in the workshop? Did the teachers seem to understand?
7. On the basis of the outcome of this workshop, what changes might you make in the objectives?

III. Presentation:

1. Did the presentation go as planned---in order, content, pacing, response?
2. What were the strengths and weaknesses? What had not been anticipated?
3. What problems arose from the facilities and materials, from the organization of the presentation, from the response--or lack of it--on the part of the teachers?
4. What changes would you recommend?

IV. Content:

1. How was the content determined?
2. (Further questions may be based on points covered, or not covered, in observation and examination of objectives.)

V. Evaluation:

On an overall basis, how would you rate the success of the workshop?

Evaluation (Continued)

1. Extremely successful
2. Very successful
3. Moderately successful, some changes needed
4. Slightly successful, considerable revision needed
5. Unsuccessful, a new approach is needed.

Interviews with selected teachers were undertaken to enrich the information provided by the questionnaires. They covered much the same grounds as the major evaluation questionnaires, but achieved far greater encouragement of participant's expression of opinion and clarification of vague responses by probing and by eliciting concrete examples. The following outline served as a guide for the interviews with teachers:

TEACHER INTERVIEWS:

1. Participation:
    1. Were adequate facilities provided for you to participate in the workshop?
    2. Were you able to see and hear the proceedings?
    3. Did the arrangement of the group allow for or limit your participation?
    4. Did you feel encouraged to participate?

II. Materials:

Were adequate materials provided to make this a true workshop?
    Quantity
    Quality
    Suitability--for meaningful participation
        for classroom application

III. Organization and presentation:
    1. Was the workshop well organized, both in content and in order of presentation?
    2. Was it thorough or limited? In what ways?
    3. Was it well paced?

IV. Purpose and objectives of the workshop:
    1. Were the purposes of the workshop made explicit, either stated or through the presentation?
    2. Were you given an opportunity at any time to express your needs, the problems that you would like to have seen discussed in the workshop?
    3. Were the objectives of the workshop practical? useful to you? realistic?
    4. Were they sufficiently diversified and inclusive?
    5. Were the objectives consistent with those of your school?
    6. What changes would you anticipate making in your own objectives?

V. Content of the workshop- Teaching methods:
    1. What has the workshop added to your skills?
    2. To what extent are these skills needed in your teaching situation?
    3. What opportunities do you anticipate having for applying what you have learned?
    4. What would you have liked more of?
    5. What would you have liked included that was omitted?
    6. What seemed of little or no use to you?
    7. What might limit your use of what you have learned?
        Your background
        Administration
        Students
        Parents or Community
    8. Are the methods and materials presented applicable in your situation?
    9. In what way did the content of the workshop apply especially to the disadvantaged child?
    10. Would the methods presented allow for individual differences?

VI. Content of the workshop-- Approach to the music:

1. Do you feel that the workshop presented a satisfactory approach to music, art, speech, library services, health education?
2. What specific activities that were presented do you feel were particularly good and useful?
3. What else could be included?
4. What would have to be omitted in your situation?
5. Do you feel that the approach is a unified one?
6. Is it an approach that could be applied throughout the school year?
7. At what grade levels would this be most applicable?
8. How would your students react to this approach ?
9. Would the type of activity presented here be appropriate in your situation? Does it conform to your objectives? What changes would you make either in the literature or in your approach?

VII. Evaluation:

On an overall basis, how would you rate the program in relation to your own classroom situation?

1. Extremely useful
2. Very useful
3. Moderately useful
4. Slightly useful
5. Not useful

How would you evaluate (Excellent - Good - Poor)

1. organization of the program ____________________
2. communication (getting information around) ____________________
3. mediation between the teacher's program and application in the schools ____________________
4. convenience of places sessions were offered ____________________
5. convenience of hours ____________________
6. quality of lectures and demonstrator ____________________
7. completeness of coverage topics ____________________
8. relevance of topics to participant's needs ____________________
9. interest, clarity, and practicality of presentation ____________________

IX. Other Institutes:

Did you attend any other Institutes from September 1965 to June 1966? Specify and briefly rate each one in terms of content, application, and recommendations?

The major evaluation questionnaire sent to all teachers for whom addresses were available is presented as Form 2 in the Appendix.
Thirty-four open-ended questions covered such matters as workshop conditions, apparent competence of instructors, appropriateness of content to needs and capabilities of participants, specific learnings and anticipated impact on classroom performance, changes and additions desired. Assessment by rating was requested in relation to ten facets of the programs, and one global rating was requested.

The rating was done on a graphic scale with five points and four intervals. The lowest extreme, mid-point and high values were marked by neutral definitions. In tabulating, each point and each interval was treated as a single step on a nine-step scale. For convenience in reporting, and because distributions of responses supported this as a logical move, the nine-step intervals were contracted into three, interpreted as indicating high, moderate and low value.

Additional area-specific information was requested for speech, health education and music. Approximately 1200 questionnaires were sent out because of the number of sessions monitored, the number of consultants involved in each session, the number of supervisory personnel and of teachers interviewed, the number of questionnaires sent out and returned, and the content of in-session questionnaires offered from one area to another. These details of data-gathering will be described separately for each content area below.

HEALTH EDUCATION: Three consultants in Health Education participated in the evaluation of this program.

Three Friday sessions from 4- 7 P.M. were given for teachers from Catholic and Protestant schools, and four Monday evening sessions for teachers from Yeshivahs. Of these, only one session was available for monitoring after the Health Education evaluation team was formed. Two Health Education specialists monitored the final session of the Friday series and submitted separate reports. The form used to collect demographic data at that session is reproduced in the Appendix, as Form 3.

Names and school addresses of the participants in the Monday evening sessions were obtained from the Board of Education for use in sending questionnaires. Mr. Donovan, the Coordinator for the Health Education Program, was interviewed.

Three Teacher-participants teaching in three different sections of the city were interviewed in person at their homes by members of the Health Education Team.

One hunred and seventy-seven evaluation questionnaires (Form 2, Appendix) were sent to participants in the program. Fifty-four were returned in time to have all ratings fully tabulated. All were scanned and all open-ended responses of 27 were fully analyzed. The questionnaires given full analysis were selected to cover all grades represented by the participants, all boroughs, and all religions represented by the participating schools.

LIBRARY SERVICES: One consultant and the Director of this evaluation covered the sessions and interviews in this program.

The program in Library Services consisted of a series of six meetings and a visit to a school library. This program was offered concurrently at two locations, one in Brooklyn and one in Manhattan, once in the afternoon and once in the evening. The last two meetings at each location were monitored. Since each meeting was broken into two sub-groups, located in separate rooms and taught by different individuals, it was possible to sample only one meeting led by each lecturer. Information was collected in each of the groups moninated concerning the existence of a library in each school represented, plans for such a library and book-ordering responsibilities of each participant.

For information about the over-all planning of this program and summaries of content of the meetings the evaluators missed, interviews were held with the Coordinator of the Teacher-Training Program for the Board of Education, with the five supervisors who conducted the sessions, and with Sister Mary Perpetua, a coordinator for the ordering of books under the Title II project associated with this program, Librarian of the Bishop McDonnel High School and a Teacher-participant in this program. Six telephone interviews were held with teachers representing a range of grade-levels, geographic distribution and religious orientations.

One hundred and five evaluation questionnaires (Form 2, Appendix) were sent to participants, and 51 were returned, with responses. All ratings on 50 questionnaires were fully tabulated. All open-ended responses of 27 questionnaires, selected to represent the broadest range of background, were fully analyzed. All questionnaires were scanned for suggestions for improvement.

MUSIC: Five consultants in music education made up the evaluation team for this program.

The Teacher-Training Program in music consisted of a series of three sessions, given in three different locations, in the Bronx, Brooklyn and Manhattan respectively. Topics for all locations were the same, but were taught by different personnel. Teams of consultant-observers monitored four of the nine meetings, one each in the Bronx and in Brooklyn, and two in Manhattan. Reports of monitored meetings focused specifically on process, content and evaluation.

Of the four monitored meetings, three covered the same topic "Orchestral and Instrumental Orientation," and one covered an additional topic "Song Flute and Recorder." One topic, "General Overview" was not monitored at all, because it was given in all three locations before the evaluation was begun.

Information about the participants was collected in all locations by means of Form 4 and 4a (See Appendix). Responses from one of the three groups were completely analyzed; others were scanned for additional information.

Photographs were taken of two of the sessions which involved teachers in active participation, for visual data to enrich the verbal reports.

Two interviews with Miss Mac Mahon, coordinator of the program in music for the Board of Education, furnished some information about the conditions and intent within which the program had been planned. Informal interviews with some of the supervisors giving the sessions gave information about organizational matters and problems of communication.

No teacher participants were directly interviewed. Questionnaires, however, were sent to approximately 125 for whom addresses were available. Fifty-seven of these were received in time to have all ratings completely tabulated. All were scanned and 48 were completely analyzed. The latter were selected to be broadly representative along lines previously indicated.

ART: The evaluation team for this program was made up of four consultants in Art Education.

The Teacher-Training Program in art consisted of two successive series of three sessions each, each session offered in two different locations, at different times of the day. Three sessions, covering all topics offered in both series, were monitored. The second series was a repetition of the first in terms of topic focus, but was planned to be an "extension" of the first, offering additional content. None of these were monitored.

Sessions were monitored by teams of consultants, who took photographs for visual reports, gathered information from participants by use of Form 5 and 6 (see Appendix), and made notes for detailed process reports. The reports were based on Form 8, (Appendix) an adaptation of the general guide for reports made by members of the art evaluation team. Reports focussed specifically on content,process, and evaluation, with the process documented by photographs.

Several interviews with Mrs. Hochman, Coordinator of the program for the Board of Education, furnished information about intent and circumstances influencing the implementation of the program.

No teachers were interviewed in person, but questionnaires were sent to 238 participants, some of whom had attended both series of sessions. One hundred and twenty-one persons returned the questionnaires, with responses. Of these, 22 had taken both series offered. Rating responses on 116 questionnaires were fully tabulated, and open-ended responses on 26 fully analyzed. These 26 papers were selected to convey the complete range of backgrounds previously cited. In addition the papers of 12 participants who were Art Teachers and of 15 who had no previous art training were selectively analyzed. Questionnaires from 10 participants who had taken both series of art sessions were also analyzed, for suggestions about the effects of the longer series. All questionnaires not otherwise analyzed were scanned for suggested improvements.

SPEECH IMPROVEMENT: Five consultants in speech improvement participated in the evaluation of this Teacher-Training Program.

The program was offered in four different segments: an all-day workshop in May, given in four different locations in the city; a session for parents in June, held simultaneously in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens and Manhattan, a series of six afternoon workshops and an equivalent series of five evening meetings, in May and June; and a series of ten half-day workshops in July.

Of this complex program, the following segments were monitored: three different topics of the May-June series, two of these at two different locations (5 different sessions); three parent sessions; and eight of the July sessions. (Information about the July participants was gathered by use of Form 7, reproduced in the Appendix.) The all-day workshops were not sampled, nor were the first meetings of the May-June series. However, since the topics and demonstrations of the one-day workshops and the May-June series were repeated during the July series, and those that had been missed earlier were covered then, all aspects of this program could be considered sampled. In addition to content reports and evaluative comments, each session was rated in accordance with Form 9, Appendix. Samples of materials distributed during the monitored sessions were collected and appraised for adequacy and appropriateness. To further ensure ample information about the monitored workshops, interviews were held with the Coordinator for the program, Mrs. Chapey, and with six supervisors involved either as speakers, demonstrators or resource people in the sessions not observed.

Eleven teachers, representing different grade levels and religious groups, were interviewed personally, in depth, and seven additional teachers were interviewed more briefly. The outline for the brief interview is presented as Form 10, Appendix.

Questionnaires were sent to approximately 480 participants of the May-June workshops. One hundred and seventy-one were returned, with responses. Rating responses on 160 were fully tabulated and open-ended responses on 35 fully analyzed.

An additional 102 questionnaires were sent to participants in the July series. Sixty-seven were returned, with responses, and all ratings were tabulated from 57 of these. All were selectively examined for estimates of usefulness of the series and suggestions for improvement.

FINDINGS

Health Education

Content and Extent of Program

Three major informational areas were covered: Health Teaching, Health Guidance and Physical Activities. Materials distributed described a physical fitness program for ages 10-17, with precise instructions for testing physical fitness, and exercises to be given between an initial test and a later retest. Mimeographed directions for teaching volley ball as a continuing activity, with sequential learnings, were also given the participants, as were a brief outline of health guidance in elementary schools, sample health guidance cards, disease charts, and suggestions for conducting a recess period in the kindergarten-primary grades.

One hundred and eighty-six individuals were registered in the program. Of these, 55 attended one session, 72 two sessions, 55 three sessions and 6 for four sessions. The participants came from 76 parochai schools.

Evaluation by Consultants

The final three-hour session was monitored by two members of the evaluation team. It was given in three parts: daily health observation (Lecture, with worksheet on problems); calisthenics and games, with and without equipment (demonstrations of games and exercises for classroom, participation of audience in calisthenics); dance (lecture on square dance, demonstration with volunteers from audience).

In their ratings of this session the two observers disagreed. The areas of assessment, the ratings and excerpts from the explanatory comments are presented below. The ratings were based on a 5-step scale, with 1 the lowest step of the scale.

A. Physical Education Objectives

1. To what extent did the workshop show the teacher representatives from the private schools how to conduct physical fitness activities such as exercise, dance, and games? Ratings: 4;2

Comments: The workshop showed several activities, and a square dance, but it was felt that it showed these activities too quickly. A better approach may have been to cover fewer activities and go into their conduct in more detail.

Teacher representatives (about 1/3 of the group) volunteered to participate in the activities conducted by these gentlemen as the rest of the teachers observed. The teacher participants and observers enjoyed the activity program. Yet, due to the short amount of time for instruction and practice in the activities (2/3rds of the group did not get an opportunity to participate at all) and the lack of background and experience of the teacher representatives with this type of activity, it is believed that for the most part the teachers were unable to grasp enough knowledge and skill to conduct well-organized, balanced, and safe instructional programs in these activities.

2. To what extent did the workshop session demonstrate use of supplies (balls, bats, gloves, etc.), and of equipment (mats, bars, horses, etc.) Ratings: 2;3

Comments: The importance of safety in the conduct of a physical activity program was briefly discussed. Various supplies used in Board of Education sponsored programs including plastic bats, balls and eye goggles, were shown to the group, and passed aroind for inspection by them. Activities in which supplies could be used were not demonstrated. There was no demonstration of the use of the equipment listed above.

B. Potentiality of Workshop for Pupil and Teacher Benefit

1. To what extent did the content of the session seem to contribute to solving classroom problems? Ratings: 3;1

Comments: The only concrete, problem-solving approach was to activities which might be presented in a limited facility such as a classroom. The other activities seemed to be presented as if everyone could walk right out and conduct them the next day with no problem. The health guidance phase gave many situations which may arise in the classroom, but did not give general rules to follow outside these instances.

There was no explanation by the conductor of the workshop as to how the workshop content could contribute to solving classroom problems of the teacher representatives of the non-public schools. It seems probable that the workshop conductors who are associated with the public school system of the city are only generally aware of the classroom problems of the non-public school teachers. It seems to be taken for granted that the teacher representatives would see for themselves how the materials presented at the workshop could be adapted to their own use in solving classroom problems relating to health guidance and physical education.

2. To what extent did the workshop session present content materials that would help meet the interests of disadvantaged children? Ratings: 4;3

Comments: The health guidance tips meet the needs of the disadvantaged child. The activity phase would seem to meet their interests as any type of organized activity would appeal to them. The competitive aspect would be needed, and this was emphasized. Also, the need for vigorous activity was emphasized, and this would appeal to the child from a disadvantaged background. An instructional program that includes a wider scope of instruction and practice in these physical education activities would be necessary for the teacher representatives to learn to conduct such activities effectively for their youngsters.

3. To what extent did the session deal with the health problems of disadvantaged children? Ratings: 2;3

Comments: The health aspects of the workshop dealt with general rather than specific principles relating to health guidance. Health materials (eg. disease charts and health record cards) used by public schools were given to the teachers. Specific health problems of disadvantaged children (if there are any) were not covered.

4. To what extent did the session contribute to teaching "innovations" with regard to physical education and health guidance in the non-public schools? Ratings: 3;3

Comments: The instructional aspects of the workshop for the most part was related to basic content (in health guidance and physical education) rather than to methodology in these areas. The session seemed too short to cover "how to" or teaching aspects of the material presented. There was a brief demonstration of the use of regular classroom equipment (chairs and waste baskets) in setting up several games. There was also a short discussion of the possibility of conducting calisthenic activities within a classroom. Little else was stated with regard to possible teaching innovations relating to physical education or health guidance activities in specific classroom situations. The session probably was entirely an innovation for these teachers with their limited background and experience in the field, and the methods taught were very good.

5. To what extent did the session contribute to any additional teaching skills related to physical education and health guidance? Ratings: 1;2

Comments: As previously related, content rather than methods of teaching was stressed at this particular workshop. For example, various calisthenics, several games and one square dance were demonstrated. Only about one third of the teachers attempted such activities (unsuccessfully for the most part). Little was related during the workshop regarding organization and instructional techniques in conducting such activities.

1. To what extent did the teacher representatives respond to the workshop? Ratings: 3;5

Comments: The response to the health guidance portion of the workshop was unenthusiastic. There was little communication and discussion between the speaker and the teacher representatives.

The response to the physical activities was enthusiastic. Participating and observing teacher representatives seemed to enjoy the exercises, games and one square dance presented in the program.

Several of the teachers in the group remarked that they felt the workshop programs were quite helpful to them in their attempts to incorporate health guidance and physical education activities in their classroom situations.

Summary Statements:

This workshop was presented in a very professional manner by competent people. It was enjoyed thoroughly by those who attended. The enthusiastic response to the fine presentation was probably due to the novelty of this type of activity workshop.

The major fault was that too much was presented in too little detail. It is believed that the teachers would have benefitted more from fewer activities presented in a clearer, more detailed manner.

In general, the workshop would be highly rated as far as presentation, and given a lower rating for the content.

EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS

ASSESSMENT BY RATING

The format of the evaluation questionnaire sent to participants in the Health Education Program provided for 20 ratings of various aspects of the program, as well as the 34 open-ended responses requested of participants in all programs.

The ratings, tabulated from 54 returned questionnaires, are reported below in percentages of responses in each category. Elimination of decimals for simplicity of reporting occasionally resulted in totals slightly less or more than 100%.

The wording of questions and the designations of rating levels have been adapted somewhat from the questionnaire for brevity and for increased clarity out of context. Reference to the number of the item on the questionnaire with which each rating was associated follows the question in parentheses.

1. Were facilities provided for active participation in training sessions adequate?

(1a)	Good to excellent	59%
	Moderately adequate	28%
	Inadequate	11%
	No response	2%

2. Were physical arrangements for seeing and hearing the proceedings satisfactory?

(2)	Good to excellent	58%
	Moderately satisfactory	34%
	Inadequate	8%

3. How well were you able to understand the content of the Workshops? How clear were the presentations?

(5)	Very clear	84%

Moderately clear	14%
Not clear	0
No response	2%

4. How appropriate was the content of the Workshops for your use?

(11)	All or almost all appropriate	66%
	About half appropriate	34%
	Little or nothing appropriate	0

5. To what extent did the activities presented allow for the expression of individual interests and varying ability among your pupils?

(12)	All variations allowed for	38%
	Moderate range of flexibility	40%
	No individuality allowed for	4%
	No response	18%

6. To what extent were the purposes of the Workshops consistent with those of your school?

(16)	Almost completely consistent	55%
	Some disagreement	28%
	Not at all consistent	0
	No response	18%

7. What have the training sessions added to your skills?

(19)	Have improved skills a great deal	34%
	Have improved skills moderately	53%
	Have improved skills little or not at all	5%
	No response	7%

8. What proportion of what you have learned in the Workshops will you be able to apply in your own school situation?

(21)	All or almost all	42%
	About half	46%
	Little or nothing	6%
	No response	7%

9. How well were your needs in this subject area implemented?

(22)	Completely or almost so	35%
	Moderately	51%
	Very little	2%
	No response	12%

10. How much of this program was specifically related to the needs of the disadvantaged children in your area?

(31)	Completely and specifically related	42%
	Only moderately - as much related to all children	45%
	Not related	0
	No response	13%

11. To what degree did the Workshops contribute to your competency in the following physical education and health education activities? (H.E.1)

a) Dance (H.E. 1a)

Extremely well	34%
Moderately	37%
Little or nothing	16%
No response	13%

b) Exercise (H.E. 1b)

Extremely useful	56%
Moderately	34%
Little or nothing	0
No response	9%

c) Games without equipment (H.E. 1d)

Extremely useful	39%
Moderately	40%
Not useful	6%
No response	16%

d) Games with equipment (H.E. 1c)

Extremely useful	38%
Moderately	42%
Not useful	6%
No response	15%

e) Use of health guidance tools (H.E. 1d)

Extremely useful	49%
Moderately useful	31%
Not useful	4%
No response	15%

12. To what degree was the demonstration of the proper use of the following materials of use to you in your school situation? (H.E. 2)

a) Physical education supplies (Balls, bats, etc.)

(H.E. 2a)	Extremely useful	39%
	Moderately useful	38%

Not useful	9%
No response	13%

b) Physical education equipment (Mats, bars, etc.)

(H.E. 2b)	Extremely useful	28%
	Moderately useful	23%
	Not useful	24%
	No response	25%

c) Health guidance tools (H.E. 2c) (Eye charts, audiometer, record forms)

Extremely useful	62%
Moderately useful	18%
Not useful	4%
No response	16%

13. To what extend did this Workshop contribute to alleviating pupil problems?

(H.E. 4)	Extremely helpful	48%
	Moderate contribution	24%
	No help	7%
	No response	22%

14. Indicate your evaluation of the Workshop sessions in health education as a whole. (34)

Good to excellent	78%
Moderately good	13%
Little or no value	0
No response	9%

From these ratings it is clear that while some presentations were more useful than others, the Workshops as a whole were enthusiastically evaluated -- at least by those who took the trouble to fill out the questionnaire and return it in time to be processed. This group comprised approximately 29% of the total attendance and 31% of those to whom questionnaires had been sent. (About 32% of those to whom questionnaires had been sent returned them, but a few came too late to be processed.) We do not know what factors influenced returning or not returning the questionnaires and cannot, therefore, extend our findings beyond our sample.

The data we do have, however, can help us discover which specific aspects of the presentations were considered most valuable, which could be improved, and what would constitute improvements from the participants' point of view.

Response to Open-ended Questions

This information should be available from responses to the open-ended questions on the sampling of questionnaires which were analyzed in detail. General statements made in this section are based on the examination of responses from 27 individuals selected to represent a broad range of relevant factors.

Qualifications and Motivations of Participants

More participants were motivated to attend by personal interest. About 30% were directed to attend; the others chose to come.

Few participants had more than a course or two in health education. One-third said they had had no training in this area, and one acknowledged advanced training.

Physical Conditions of Workshops

Most participants said they could see and hear the proceedings adequately. A few complained of the pillars in the cafeteria and suggested a microphone was needed in the large gymnasium.

Opportunities for Participation

About a third of the participants felt the opportunities for participation were adequate. Others felt there was not enough time for participation and application of new learnings, and that the groups were too large.

Some suggested separation of the groups into male and female sections for the active participation aspect of the Workshops.

Adequacy of Communication About the Workshops

More than half the participants reported some difficulty in learning about the Workshops. Suggestions to remedy this in the future included the following:

1. Separate notifications to religious and to secular divisions of Yeshivahs.
2. Some device for insuring that all the lay teachers, as well as the teachers in orders, are informed.
3. Separate notifications to boys' and girls' divisions.
4. Earlier notice, well before start of sessions.

Changes and Additions Desired

The following suggestions concerning changes were made:

a) That separate courses be offered for those teaching girls and those teaching boys.

b) That more opportunity for feedback about individual needs be made available, e.g., outline or checklist circulated before sessions start, for teachers to indicate interests; more time for discussion at sessions.

c) More games and exercises for classrooms and confined spaces.

d) More activities for girls.

e) More activities for primary grades

f) More activities for junior high and high school children.

g) More dancing; folk-dancing derived from Latin-American cultures.

h) More information on symptoms of children's illnesses.

i) More on health education for different grade levels.

j) More attention to health problems of the disadvantaged.

k) More information about hygiene and nutrition.

l) More than three sessions.

m) Narrower range of subject-matter for each session, covered in greater depth.

n) Smaller classes, opportunity for all to participate.

o) Workshops given at the beginning and throughout the school year.

p) First aid.

q) More information about clinics.

r) More training in teaching games with equipment.

s) More games without equipment, suitable for crowded classrooms.

t) More supplementary materials summarizing what was taught.

Most Useful Items

The following were considered of greatest immediate value:

a) Use of the audiometer and eye chart.

b) Games for the classroom.

c) Exercises for classroom use.

d) The Board of Education syllabus.

e) Information about services available through the public schools.

f) Health guidance information.

Special Utility for Disadvantaged Children

The participants saw special utility in the training these Workshops gave for the disadvantaged child for the following reasons:

a) Health needs are not cared for adequately by parents.

b) Sensory abnormalities are likely to be overlooked at home.

c) Because they are often restricted to small apartments, school often offers their only opportunity for systematic exercise and play.

d) Because play often means only fighting to them, they need to be taught the fun of organized physical activities.

e) Adequate health habits are not taught at home.

f) They tend to be tense and exercise can help them relax in a quiet atmosphere.

g) They tend to be slow in academics and physical activities give them a chance to achieve.

When asked the purposes of the Workshops, however, the participants did not spontaneously mention disadvantaged children at all. Their understanding emphasized help to the parochial schools, and several made wry remarks about "getting rid of Federal money." There seems to be a need for clarification here.

Congruence with the Parochial Schools

Almost all the participants mentioned lack of space, lack of funds for equipment, and lack of trained personnel as limiting factors on their improving health education programs in their schools. Several urged that some dialogue be undertaken between the Board of Education personnel and the parochial school personnel to establish understanding of conditions under which the latter operate.

Despite the less than perfect conditions and implementation of their needs, a majority of the participants declared they would participate in another training program in health education, if it offered additional learnings, even if remuneration were not available. Participants agreed that the instructors revealed a thorough grasp of their subjects and the variety of activities maintained a high level of interest. Moreover, the sessions aroused awareness of the importance of physical fitness and health education. Many intend to use what they learned daily, within their classrooms, for relaxation between academic sessions. It is to be hoped that materials even more specifically congruent with the capabilities and needs of the parochial schools can be presented in future programs.

Library Services: Content and Extent of Program

The two parallel series of meetings comprising this program differed somewhat in content and emphasis. In both series, the first meeting was devoted to an overview of what a school library should be. Succeeding meetings in the afternoon series covered the following topics: overview of book processing, book selection aids, preparing catalogue cards, and a brief introduction to story-telling. The evening series proceeded as follows: Sessions 2, 3, 4 devoted to organization and administration of school library; Session 5, story-telling, with visual aid; Session 6, children's literature. All participants were guided on a visit to at least one school library.

Total attendance for this program was 130, from 62 schools. Twenty-three attended one session only, and nine others attended fewer than five sessions. Eighty-two persons attended six or seven sessions.

Evaluation by Consultant

Monitoring and interviews were conducted by Mrs. Mary Hellman, Coordinator of Reference Services at the Harry A. Sprague Library, Montclair State College. With training in both library science and elementary education, having herself been responsible for initiating school library services, having taught courses in the administration and supervision of school libraries and served as Library Specialist on educational evaluating teams, Mrs. Hellman was well prepared to assess this pioneering effort. Her evaluation report follows:

1. Background on preparation for the program.

Planning the workshop - The coordinator was given only a few weeks notice to organize the program, recruit a teaching staff and notify prospective participants of the workshop. It was an almost superhuman task and the fact that it was initiated at this late period of the school year (April 28 - June 7) is evidence of a tremendous effort and good cooperation on the part of all the supervisors, the coordinator and participants.

Several aspects of the program which were contemplated never materialised because time grew so short and no final word ever came from the authorities to complete these plans. Specifically, we refer to an effort to extend the number of sessions in June, because everyone connected with the program felt the need for more time. The other plan was a proposal to have a meeting with parents of children from the schools represented to give them an idea of what the schools were planning in development of libraries.

Staffing the workshops was a problem because of the limitations placed by the Board of Education on what hours district library supervisors could work on this project. In order to make it possible for participants to attend, late afternoon sessions as well as evening sessions had to be scheduled.

Choosing a location was also a problem because it was thought that it should be centrally located for widest coverage from Brooklyn, Queens, Bronx and Manhattan. There was also the problem of finding a school which was not already scheduled for use at this late date in the school year.

2. Background on status of participating schools and teachers.

Most of the participating non-public schools had no libraries at all. A few had classroom collections and a few had small central libraries in varying stages of development which were being organized with volunteer parent help.

Most of the participants (with a few exceptions, e.g., a few principals and a professional librarian) had no background in the field of library service. They were primarily teachers and in many cases had never taught in a school that had a central library. However, they had experience in teaching the disadvantaged child and had some working knowledge of the problems of the disadvantaged child. In most cases they recognized the need for library development in their schools. (One participant when interviewed stated that she had never been convinced of the need for a central library until she took the workshop.)

In the Catholic schools there is an additional problem related to the system of staffing these schools. Teachers do not necessarily stay in the same school for a number of years. When interviewed, each Sister indicated that although she would very much like to help in organizing a library, she did not know and would not know until September what school she would be assigned to and what her responsibilities would be.

Whatever differences of opinion were expressed concerning the workshops, there was complete unanimity by the participants in voicing their very deep appreciation and gratitude for the opportunity to participate, for the efforts of the supervisors and for the friendly welcome they had received. They also agreed that they would very much like to continue further study in Library Service.

3. Background on Supervisors and Coordinator of the Program.

All Supervisors and the Coordinator were district librarians at the Board of Education who were called in on short notice to develop this program. They had to make a choice, in planning the program, of trying to present an overview of library service and attempt to cover as many areas as possible, or to concentrate on what seemed most urgently needed for the participants to start their libraries.

Having had the experience of starting libraries themselves and of assisting numerous elementary schools in starting libraries, and having had the experience of presenting in-service courses in library service for teachers, the supervisors and coordinator drew up a plan in the week before the sessions began which was admittedly a compromise. It was hoped that this plan would cover the key areas of library service and give the participants enough preparation to get started.

This consultant was only able to observe the workshop during the last two weeks of the program. We observed each supervisor, interviewed each supervisor and had several conferences with the coordinator, and interviewed seven participants formally and several others informally before some of the sessions.

It is not difficult to see how a school librarian would work very closely with teachers in a remedial reading program as well as the regular classroom teacher. It is apparent that any program designed to train teachers to give effective library service to the disadvantaged child must take into account what is known about the background, problems and interest of these children. Let us examine how effectively these goals and objectives were carried out in the library training program conducted this spring.

1. Location of workshop - The locations chosen were convenient for some but entailed long trips for others. However, the question arises whether the physical environment of these workshops was an effective place for such a program. The obvious place for a teacher-training program in library service would be an elementary school library. It is understandable that it was not practical to make such an arrangement for this workshop.

2. Size of classes - The classes averaged 30 or more in a group. This is too large.

3. Content of the workshop -

Organization. The plan for 6 sessions (plus a library visit) attempted to touch the highlights of library service. However, the afternoon session supervisors spent more than half of the sessions on the organization of the library and book processing procedures. In the afternoon sessions the literature was discussed in a less organized way than in the evening classes. Story-telling technique in the afternoon session was reduced to a 20-minute lecture, whereas in the evening sessions it received a full hour treatment with an additional hour of demonstration of A-V materials available.

The justification for the prolonged discussion on organization and processing in the afternoon classes was expressed by the supervisors who stated that there was a great deal of apprehension in the group about how to actually cope with the books and get the library started. Considering the lack of library experience and training this is understandable.

The trip to a school library was a valuable experience. If the workshops were held in school libraries this trip might take some other form, perhaps a visit to the local public library to see how a working relationship between school and community services can be established.

4. Skills developed in the workshop -

In those classes where cataloging was stressed, the participants gained some skill in making out sets of catalog cards, recording accessions and keeping a shelf list in order. But we question the advisability of spending so much time on this "housekeeping" operation in the library when at the same time the participants were being urged to buy the printed cards. One lesson would be sufficient to explain the use and handling of these cards. Again, class presence in a library would have brought this subject to life and made it much easier to show the practical application.

Furthermore, a very rigid approach, which went far beyond realistic needs of the participants, was evidenced by one supervisor's emphasis on such fine points as the use of the period and exact spacing.

5. Literature of the workshops -

There was an effort made by all supervisors to introduce some of the most important basic bibliographic tools in the field. However, as indicated above, the evening groups were given a better balance. They had at least one full hour on children's literature, with a discussion of some standards for selection. They also had a fuller discussion of story-telling with examples of material suitable for use. The story-telling session was undoubtedly the most successful session and vividly demonstrated an aspect of library service that all the participants agreed was most helpful.

To what extent did the use of children's literature in the workshop fit in with the concept of service for the disadvantaged child? Was there an attempt to introduce to the participants "new materials appropriate for use with the disadvantaged - or to develop techniques or methods of using new materials - or the presentation of bibliographies for students in depressed areas"? Our observation indicated that this was the weakest aspect of the program. Keeping in mind all the difficulties under which the program was developed - shortness of time, lack of facilities, etc. - it is our carefully considered opinion that more planning, more imaginative thinking and perhaps even a little experimentation is needed in this area.

The main concept behind the whole program, i.e., library service for the disadvantaged child, was only touched on tangentially now and then. Somehow this prime objective in the training program, which should have been an outstanding and recurring theme throughout seems to have become only an occasional passing note.

In only one session on literature, presented by Mrs. Langhorne on June 9, was there discussion to any degree of some of the problems of selecting materials suitable for the poor reader, e.g., the problem of high interest level and low reading level materials; materials that would involve the recreational interest of children, etc.

Furthermore, except for one evening session on story-telling, where A-V materials were used, there seemed little indication that today's concept of a school library program involved a broader concept than use of books. A.L.A. Standards for School Library Programs encompasses this concept by using the phrase "The Materials Collection." The National Study of Secondary School Evaluation in its Evaluative Criteria, which can readily be applied in many aspects to elementary schools, sets up standards for "Instructional Materials Services - Library and Audio-Visual." A wide variety of materials - books, periodicals, pictures, pamphlets, filmstrips, films, recordings and tapes are considered essential library materials today. It is recognized that although books are still the backbone of the library, other materials may stimulate children to further reading.

It is worthwhile repeating the story told in an interview by one of the participants, because this teacher had enough imagination to see the potentialities of phonograph records to stimulate reading. In discussing what she did to stimulate interest in books (she was one of the few who already had a small school library in operation) she told of spending several hours at the Donnell Library selecting records of music from foreign countries. She chose exotic styles from such countries as Japan, India, Israel, etc. Then she played the records to a number of classes. Her approach was to encourage the children to guess from what country the music came. This led to a discussion of the countries, and, as the children's curiosity was aroused, the library was flooded with requests for books about these countries. Thus, with a simple device, a phonograph record with some native music a librarian had stimulated a whole series of activities that involved library materials. It was my observation that most of the participants would have profited from more discussion of this type of creative service. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that this participant (from the evening class), who already had a good grasp of library services for children would have liked more time spent on technical services. She was the exception, however, and could no doubt learn what she needed to know in one or two sessions.

Some further comments on techniques and materials used in workshops -

1. Materials used - supervisors introduced a varied selection of tools on reading materials in the form of bibliographies, flyers, books and workbooks on how to use the library.
2. Content of sessions - varied in interest from very dull (on making up catalog cards) to very interesting (story-telling and children's literature lessons).
3. Participants felt free to discuss, but there was not enough time. Supervisors and participants were very conscious of the time limitation and frequently expressed their frustration at how much had to be skipped in each session.

   The most lively session from the viewpoint of participation was the session on Children's Literature conducted by Mrs. Langhorne. She had the ability to elicit ideas from the class as she developed various basic principles on how to select books, etc.
4. Some problem solving was introduced in a few sessions during the question period. This was especially true in the same literature class mentioned above. It also appeared on some occasions in the afternoon sessions during the work periods when catalog cards were being written out.
5. Imaginative use of facilities and materials best evidenced in the story-telling and literature session; but it was still limited because much more emphasis

should have been placed on how to reach the disadvantaged child with these materials and techniques.

6. Recommendations to visit the A.L.A. Convention being held in N.Y.C. in July were excellent examples of encouraging outside exploration of services for librarians. Also in this category, were the visit to a school library and for the evening group, to the Children's Book Council. This might have been further extended to include the public library, museums and other places of interest to arouse curiosity and open up new vistas for children who never see many facets of N.Y.C.

7. Because of lack of time, there was no participation of the class in storytelling or book talks. There was some evidence that the participants were encouraged to discover new materials in the recommendations to visit the book exhibit at the A.L.A. Convention and in the visit to the Children's Book Council. However, it would have been more valuable if preparation for these visits included discussion of what to look for in the search for material especially suited to the disadvantaged child.

8. Creative approach to content and materials -

   Again this was most evident in the lessons on story-telling and children's literature. The supervisors were very well aware of the limitations placed upon them by lack of time to fully develop ideas in such areas as book selection, reading guidance and teacher-librarian relationships. There was no time to explore such subjects as how the librarian can assist the classroom teacher in developing a unit of study by supplying suitable library materials to stimulate student interest.

Evaluation by Participants

Ratings: The evaluation questionnaire sent to participants requested them to rate eleven aspects of the program. Ratings were tabulated from 50 questionnaires, for 38.5% of the total attendance, and about 48% of the questionnaires sent out. Results of the tabulation are presented below, by percentage of participants responding at each value-level. (Referrents are the same as items numbered 1-10 and 14 in the section on participants' evaluation of the Health Education program. Here they will be abbreviated. Figures in parentheses refer to item numbers on the questionnaire).

1. Facilities for participation by teachers. (1a)

Good to excellent	14%
Moderately adequate	68%
Inadequate	14%
No response	4%

2. Physical arrangements of workshops. (2)

Good to excellent	22%
Moderately satisfactory	66%
Inadequate	12%

3. Clarity of presentations. (5)

Very clear	70%
Moderately clear	30%
Not clear	0

4. Appropriateness of content. (11)

Almost all appropriate	62%
About half "	38%
Little or nothing "	0

5. Allowance for individual differences. (12)

All variations allowed for	26%
Moderate flexibility	36%
None allowed for	18%
No response	20%

6. Harmony of workshop objectives with school objectives. (16)

Almost completely consistent	54%
Some disagreement	30%
Not at all consistent	2%
No response	14%

7. Addition to teacher's skills. (19)

A great deal	36%
Moderate addition	54%
Little or nothing	6%
No response	4%

8. Proportion of content applicable in teacher's school situation. (21)

All or almost all	46%
About half	40%
Little or nothing	4%
No response	10%

9. Degree of implementation of teacher's needs. (22)

Completely or almost so	18%
Moderately	76%
Very little	0
No response	6%

10. Specific relationship of content to needs of disadvantaged. (31)

Completely & specifically related	48%
Moderately - as much related to all children	40%
Not related	10%
No response	2%

11. General evaluation of workshop sessions in Library Services. (34)

Good to excellent	70%
Moderately good	16%
Little or no value	8%
No response	6%

It will be noted that although the global evaluation of the workshops was high, questions that touched on specific relationships of the program to teacher's needs, teacher's skills, existing school situations and needs of the disadvantaged elicited fewer evaluations at the upper level.

Responses to Open-ended Questions

The following remarks are made on the basis of detailed analyses of responses on 28 questionnaires. Respondents included teachers of classes from kindergarten through the eighth grade, representing all religious orientations and geographic locations.

Qualifications and motivation of participants. Most of the individuals in the selected subgroup had had no previous training in library science. Three, however, had had concentrated training in this subject matter, and were, in fact, school librarians.

All but one person said they came because of interest in the subject matter, in anticipation of setting up new libraries or in relation to class libraries.

Physical conditions and opportunities for participation. Most found these aspects moderately satisfactory. Several remarked that a library setting would be preferable to the classroom for the sessions. Several believed that actual participation in a library setting would facilitate retention of the information given.

Changes and additions desired. Aside from the change to a library setting noted above, participants wanted more thorough coverage of a broad range of library services, and more time to absorb and practice what was being taught. Several called the course "too elementary." Participants in the afternoon course felt the scope was too limited. Others wanted more detailed work on library organization and management. Others wished more extensive training in choice of children's literature and in story-telling. Almost all felt there should be more specific attention to the disadvantaged, from choice of literature to methods for connecting the child up with the book.

In future sessions, participants would like presentations directed to their specific type of school situations and to their functions as teachers primarily.

They want instructors to visit the parochial schools for a view of conditions, and they want them to speak from an understanding of how little time there is in a teacher's day to function as a librarian. They would like aid in increasing the amount of library service in schools without increasing costs. They would like a chance to examine more books, and to handle more of the materials more extensively.

Several suggested library apprentice-shops. They want book lists, by grade level, for disadvantaged children. They want more information about use of filmstrips, tapes, records, and other audio-visual aids. Interest was also expressed in ways of interesting children in the library and methods for helping poor readers select appropriate books. Most want more and more training.

Most useful items. Referring to the 1965-66 sessions, the following were considered most useful:

(a) Story-telling, with audio-visual aids
(b) Ordering and processing books
(c) Library organization and management
(d) Knowledge of where to find library materials
(e) Aids for book selection.

Special utility for the disadvantaged child. When asked for their understanding of the purposes of the workshops, only two mentioned or implied a connection with disadvantaged children. When asked specifically how this program contributed to the disadvantaged, several replied "not enough." The major application seen was seen as general, such as encouragement to read, making books available, helping overcome effects of slum living by reading.

Relevance to situation of parochial schools. Comments on what might limit usefulness of information acquired included the following: lack of a school library, lack of space, lack of teaching time, lack of funds, classes too large and crowded, schedule too full to permit library time. Many participants felt the instructors were unrealistic in their orientation to the teacher's situation.

Criticisms. Negative assessments included the following: Rooms were too hot and crowded; too much repetition of subject matter; some speakers not well organized; too much time spent on cataloging; questions from audience interfered with continuity; too much time taken up by one or two individuals in the audience.

Despite these criticisms, however, 64% of this sample said they would participate in other training programs in Library Services, if offered. Of these, 54% would participate even without remuneration, if the course were geared to their needs.

On the whole, most of the participants were pleased to have had this opportunity for an introduction to library training. Their needs and desires for the future seem to have been adequately perceived by the program coordinator, and the specialized courses now being planned, as indicated in Mrs. Hellman's evaluation above, should fit their needs.

SUMMATION OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board of Education should consider very carefully the possibility of developing some flexibility in its rules and regulations so that it may become possible to implement this program more effectively.

1. Give coordinators and supervisors sufficient time to prepare any future training programs in the field of library service. Two months at least are necessary to prepare the curriculum content for the workshops, recruit a suitable staff, and arrange practical details of time, place, etc.
2. Choice of Location - Hold workshop in elementary school libraries that are sufficiently developed to serve as models for a well-organized library. Perhaps one library in each district would be a practical arrangement.
3. Size of Classes - Limit classes to a maximum of 15 participants so that the sessions may be conducted as laboratory sessions as required. Library training should involve practical application of principles and procedures. This can only be carried out in small groups.
4. Recruit experts in such fields as reading problems, story-telling, children's literature and A-V materials in relation to the disadvantaged child. Some supervisors who participated in this workshop were well qualified in some of these areas. If there are not enough trained experts with the time to participate in these workshops, the Board of Education should consider going beyond the N.Y.C. school system to recruit distinguished people in the field, not necessarily for a whole series of sessions, but perhaps as guest lecturer to enrich the program.

5. Develop more articulation with the administrators of parochial schools so that some continuity can be developed in building up elementary school libraries and servicing them. The present system of assigning Sisters to different schools every year or two makes smooth operation of a library program extremely difficult. Is it possible for the Diocese to make an exception in their policy of shifting staff in the case of those assigned to libraries?
6. Articulation with Title II Projects - There should be better articulation between Title I and Title II Projects. Since Title II provides money for the books which participants in Title I are to be using, it is most essential that the "right hand know what the left hand is doing". Too many participants in Title I were not informed about book ordering procedures. But these participants should be exercising judgment in the selection of books. Only in the Brooklyn Diocese was there evidence of an attempt on the part of Sister Mary Perpetua, Coordinator of Title II, to keep informed of the Title I Program by attending the workshops.

Since coordination of both of these programs rests with the Bureau of Libraries, is there any reason why the coordinators of Title I and Title II cannot articulate their programs to better advantage? For example, the possibility of commercial book processing should be fully explored with a view to relieving the participants in Title I from book processing, so that they may spend their time on the educational aspects of library service rather than the technical. The price is well within the range of economy. Bro-Dart has quoted a price of $ .60 per book. In quantity ordering, this price would be reduced. Even clerical labor adds more to the cost of processing than this.

This recommendation is made with the full realization that various rules and regulations of the Board of Education would make a speedy changeover to this procedure impossible. But since the program for non-public schools is expected to go on for several years, it is urged that consideration be given to the use of commercial processing for future years. It seems to be the only practical solution, aside from central cataloging at the Bureau of Libraries, which will make it possible for untrained or partly-trained teachers stepping into school libraries to function effectively in their educational roles.

7. Allow more sessions for the workshops. The Coordinator of the program has been considering three different workshops running concurrently:

   one on organization and administration
   one on story-telling
   one on book-selection and children's literature.

   It is recommended that the organization and administration course run for at least 8 or 10 sessions with the emphasis on reader's services, reading guidance, librarian-teacher relationships, orientation in the use of the library, etc., rather than concentration on book processing.

   The course on children's literature and book selection should be broadened to include other library materials and A-V equipment and should also run for at least 8 or 10 sessions.

   Story-telling and book talks might be combined for another course. In all these workshops, the emphasis should be on service to the disadvantaged children and how their background and problems relate to library service and selection of materials.

MUSIC

Content and Extent of Program

The content of the Teacher Training Program in music is fully covered in the evaluation report prepared by the team of consultant-observers in music education and is presented below. The Program's sessions were attended by 163 participants, from 71 schools, and twenty-two of these participants attended one session only.

Evaluation by Consultants

The Music Evaluation Team, headed by Dr. John Gilbert, monitored all the sessions available for observation. At the time the Team was organized, during the final week of May, 1966, the Teacher Training Program had already completed five of the nine sessions scheduled.

Three topics were covered in the program: (1) a general overview to the music program, (2) the instrumental program, and (3) the song-flute program, which included the teaching of a song with a record. The Music Evaluation Team was able to observe the instrumental program and the song-flute program, but there was no opportunity to observe the initial overview program.

This evaluation of the Teacher Training Program is general in nature. Further, due to the late implementation of the observations, it is also largely descriptive.

The following areas will be covered in the evaluation: (1) the purpose and objectives of the Workshop, relating this to the project description, (2) the content of the Workshop, including the actual approach to the music,

(3) the content of the Workshop in the teaching methods employed by the demonstrator, or the lecturer, (4) the organization and presentation of the Workshop, (5) the materials used and their adequacy and relevance, and (6) the participation of the teachers in the Workshop. This will be followed by an overall evaluation.

1. Purposes of the Workshops

Two workshops, one at Bronx Public School No. 135 and the other at Junior High School 44 in Manhattan, seemed to have rather explicit purposes, and outlines of the presentation were distributed to the participants before each of the programs began. The teachers were well organized regarding content and procedures of presentation. However, neither of the teachers had any idea as to the qualifications, abilities, needs, and/or the experiences of the teachers who would be participating in the workshop.

Relationship of objectives of workshops to disadvantaged child in non-public school

Little mention was made, during the workshop, of the "disadvantaged child" or of the specific teaching techniques or materials designed for the disadvantaged. However, the techniques and the materials that were presented seem to be appropriate for work with children in practically any music program, disadvantaged or not.

In one workshop, the demonstrator's personal experience had been with disadvantaged children. He made reference to this at the beginning of the project, showing that the music program itself gave a sense of dignity and a sense of responsibility to children who didn't have anything comparable at home. This established a feeling that they were "somebody".

The basic approach of the Instrumental Workshop seemed to be one of "how do we find the children to enter into the program?" A great deal of attention was devoted to a music aptitude test which screened children who seemed to have an aptitude to play certain instruments, to recognize rhythms and respond to different tonal patterns. This approach might actually exclude a disadvantaged child who would have less opportunity for exposure to music in the home.

In the one workshop there was little opportunity for any of the participants to express their own needs since only half of the agenda was covered during the session, and a very brief period was available for discussion at the end of the workshop. In discussing the practicality of the objectives of the workshop, it appeared that both of these workshops were geared essentially to secondary music education of an instrumental nature. Most of the participants came from schools where there were no instrumental programs in existence and very little likelihood that there would be one developed in any strength in the near future. Therefore, the practicality of the objectives as presented held only long-term promise.

In one instrumental workshop observed, the participants were given a great deal of opportunity to engage in worthwhile activities themselves. However, in a workshop of such limited duration, it is very difficult to have the students gain enough proficiency to initiate an instrumental program in their own schools.

The needs and the interests of the participants were not discovered before the program was organized. Because of this, the teacher was handicapped in presenting material relevant to the participants' needs. It apparently was assumed that the experience of the public schools would transfer to the non-public school situation.

In the case of Public School No. 135 in the Bronx, the objective of the lecturer was to give an overview of what one would have to learn to teach instruments. Thirty or forty minutes were devoted to instruction on the violin, until the group could play a very simple tune pizzicato, without using bows. Technique on the trumpet and the clarinet was only demonstrated because of lack of instruments. Discussion about the instruments followed.

The instrumental workshop at Willian O'Shea Junior High School was a well organized presentation covering very well the administrative problems of an instrumental program effectively structured into the various areas needing consideration. This administrative approach received thorough treatment. This would be appropriate for a group that was ready to launch a program immediately. However, the participants at the workshop seemed to expect something more than orientation in the administrative problems of an instrumental program. While they seemed to appreciate the workshop in general, they felt that many of their more pertinent problems were left unanswered.

It was evident in the question and answer period that the teachers attending were not clear as to how they were to use the information imparted in the workshop. Some had the impression that they were to be the ones who would be teaching in the parochial schools. Others felt they were merely representatives to help organize the program, and that public school teachers would come into the parochial schools and teach the program. In

In considering whether the objectives of the workshop were practical or useful to the participants, one of the problems to consider is that there seemed to be no way of determining exactly what the needs of non-public schools would be in organizing a program. The assumption seemed to be that the non-public school music programs would consist of instrumental, song-flute and vocal programs. Whether these programs are essential, appropriate, and practical for immediate implementation in the non-public schools is a matter needing further consultation, study, and research.

A workshop which dealt with learning of songs from a record and development of a song-flute program was particularly good from the standpoint of objectives which would have continuing relevance for the participants. They were materials that could be used with a beginning class, and were presented in such a way that the teacher would have basic concepts rather than specific techniques upon which to base the learning experiences. In other words, in working with a song, the participant coming to the workshop was instructed on how to organize listening experiences and how to develop rhythmic experiences with a song. This developed an understanding of an approach to the music which could be pursued from a simple to a more complex level, utilizing the same techniques introduced in the workshop.

The workshops confined themselves very largely to instrumental music. For example, those workshops that devoted to teaching and demonstration of song-flutes, or violins, or a general instrumental program, though overlapping, were still in the instrumental area. Therefore whole blocks of music education seemed to be neglected. General music, treated in the workshop given before the music observation team was organized, should permeate the workshops since many of the students that are disadvantaged or educationally deprived would presumably be in need of a program which would develop backgrounds and habits through a directed listening program aimed at increasing the children's awareness and sensitivity to musical sensitivity.

Many participants went to the repetition of the workshop the following week. This seemed to create needless repetition of the same material.

2

The three workshops were given in different boroughs. Two were at the same time on Saturday in Brooklyn and the Bronx. The third was on Wednesday evening in Manhattan. This breakdown was necessary and convenient for the operation of the program. Many teachers wanted to attend the repetition in order to expand their experience.

In considering the objectives of the workshops in terms of the stated procedures for the program, it would appear that the objectives were meant specifically for single and separate workshops, and were not directed toward a long term program as is outlined in the project description. The objectives of discrete presentations havenot been made to be carried through into the classroom for the non-public school teacher.

In the statement of the project description the emphasis was in basically three areas: musical skills, additional teaching techniques, and innovation in content. The summary view of the workshops is that in most cases the teacher had no background in music. Rather than additional skills and techniques, there had to be treatment of foundations and background.

The three different approaches in the three different workshops (instrumental music, song flutes, and general music, or general overview to the music program) seemed to have no overlap or continuity between each workshop. There was no developmental aspect to the workshops in developing understanding of musical skills or teaching techniques. Little treatment or exploration was given to any kind of innovation in content. Part of the trouble probably lies in the fact that the project description is too general and vague to be of much use. The three areas of music skills, teaching techniques, and innovation in content are so broadly stated that a great deal of care and consideration should go into the formulation of more specific objectives of the workshops as a series and each workshop in particular.

2. Content Of The Workshop Approach To The Music

The workshops observed varied in their approach to the music. One limited itself quite specifically to the presentation of specific musical instruments following a general overview of an instrumental program. It seemed to develop a limited approach to musical activities. It did not actually relate to the music itself, but rather concerned itself strictly with instrumental techniques isolated from music literature.

Another workshop did take a satisfactory approach to musical activities. The approach enhanced and developed all of the elements of music as participating teachers were introduced to melodic and rhythmic characteristics. There was an approach to harmony in the singing of canons. The elements of style were introduced. The approach was unified in the sense of developing various musical activities in relation to a particular piece of music. The participants actually experienced the activities as they would present them to the students. They sang through the music; they played rhythm instruments in accompaniment; they were given an approach to listening. They were told how to listen, and how they would be able to apply the ideas presented in the demonstration. The level at which this would be applicable would probably be the third or fourth to sixth-grade level.

The instrumental workshops, at Lefferts Junior High and at O'Shea Junior High, were geared to a lecture approach with very little demonstration. At Lefferts Junior High School, the demonstration was limited basically to clapping of rhythmic exercises written on the board. This was used to introduce certain kinds of initial techniques in an approach to developing sensitivity to rhythm. No instruments were exhibited. The kinds of problems encountered in teaching readiness for the instrument or actually playing instruments were never really clarified. At William O'Shea, the demonstrator exhibited several of the instruments, laying stress to the fact that the presence of the instruments themselves lent great motivation to the students. The lecturer demonstrated several of the instruments by playing on them and discussed, very generally, some of the problems that might be encountered in deciding which students should play which instrument. The approach to the instrumental program seemed geared more or less to the secondary level, primarily junior high school, using the junior high school as a pivotal point for the elementary program and secondary school program. This left much to be desired in explaining how this could be transferred and applied to the elementary school level, which apparently seems to be the scope of this program in dealing with disadvantaged children. There was little reference made to the music itself other than a passing reference to some of the items mentioned on the mimeographed material passed out to the teachers. In this it was pointed out that certain songs employed certain limited ranges, and it was therefore possible to have all of the students succeeding quickly in playing, on their various instruments, songs in unison.

The instrumental workshops seemed to stress the development of musical skills almost to the exclusion of musical understanding. The basic shortcoming of instrumental workshops is that musical concepts were not treated thoroughly in relation to the instrumental program. The questions, what is melody, what is rhythm, what is form, what is harmony--how are these things related in the music, how do these various elements of the music actually give the music its musical meaning, were never integrated into the instrumental program.

In discussing what might have been included in the workshops, one thing specifically deserves consideration. This program was intended to be directed toward the teachers of pupils in the student enrichment programs which serviced the elementary child. It would have been useful to have some elementary children present to use the instruments in illustrating particular problems involved in teaching the elementary children. Simple problems such as holding the instruments over a sustained period of time, in which the children get tired, could be effectively demonstrated. The weight of the instrument on a child's thumb when playing the clarinet, for instance, becomes quite painful. A child gets discouraged and wants to give up the instrument.

In one instrumental workshop observed, it seemed that motivation could have been enhanced by involving the participants in playing some simple melodies.

The song flute demonstration seemed to be very appropriate for very young elementary school students. It was presented in a very simple, direct manner. A concept of melody was utilized by explaining that more fingers added to the instrument lowered the sound because the instrument is lengthened. Some concepts of rhythm were introduced in this particular demonstration, but to a very limited extent. Materials were provided to enable teachers to continue developing more flexibility and more technique. The song flute demonstration was probably more appropriate for the elementary school level than the other workshops because it dealt with music reading skills on a much more rudimentary basis.

It would seem that the purpose of the instrumental presentation was to orient the teachers to the nature of an instrumental program, perhaps to provide them with some sort of goal in the elementary program. However, there was no effort to make explicit that this was the objective. In presenting this program there was little attempt to show how this might lead to the development of an elementary program that would lead to an instrumental program. As a matter of fact, from the standpoint of the questions asked, (particularly at the O'Shea school which had about 30 minutes for questions and discussions), it would seem that some of the teachers hoped to form immediately an instrumental group of some sort that would serve as public-relations group for the school and also to participate in assembly programs. It was felt that these groups would be organized as extracurricular activities. The problems of the disadvantaged child in music seemed to receive little attention. Teachers seemed more interested in the introduction of music into the non-public schools, more or less on the same level--or with same approach--as the public school have utilized.

The lecturer dealt with administrative problems of an instrumental music program. The participants felt that their school day was quite long and their schedule was extremely tight. They anticipated no possibility of instituting an instrumental program in a schedule which was too crowded with other more important subjects or more academically-oriented subjects.

3. Content - Teacher Methods

The workshops are now considered from the standpoint of how they may have added to the skills of the teacher (one of the stated objectives), any additional techniques that might have been discussed in the actual teaching of music in the classroom, and any innovations in content that might have appeared. Basically, in the instrumental workshop, both at Lefferts Junior High and at O'Shea Junior High, the teaching method utilized was, as stated before, lecture method. The exception was that, at the end of the discussion, or at the end of the lecture, the time was provided for discussion and for questions. Regarding demonstrable skills that might be taken into the classroom by the teachers involved in the workshop, very little was included except in a general overview of an approach to the reading of very simple rhythms and simple notation. Quite often the symbol of the notation was put on the board before the actual rhythmic experience occurred. This seemed to provide -- for those who had no background in music -- a slight problem in reading. For those who did have some experience, the examples were, perhaps, too elementary. The skills therefore confined to two areas: music reading and music rhythm. There was no other skill demonstrated, other than the lecture.

The song-flute portion of this series relied more on demonstration. The song flute demonstration which took place at P.S. No. 44, including an approach to learning a new song through a recorded selection involved the participants in the workshop to a great extent. The participants were always very active and highly interested. The material was always presented in an aural manner first. A recording was played and the participants were instructed to listen to the recording; secondly, the recording was played and the students were told to whisper the words very softly -- being careful not to overshadow the recording. The recording was played a number of times before the participants were actually given an opportunity to view the notation placed on a large music staff on the blackboard. The recording was played ten times before the notation was actually referred to by having one of the participants go to the staff and follow the notation as the recording was played. At Lefferts Junior High School, a brief demonstration utilizing the participants indicated how to involve children the first day in learning to follow a conductor, establishing some of the procedures that would be used in rehearsal techniques. For example, after it was established how to read quarter-notes, half-notes and whole-notes, the conductor then directed the audience in clapping these note values in various combinations. He utilized the situation to show that when his hands went up the instruments should be ready to play... in this case it simply meant getting the hands ready to clap. This communicated the whole idea of watching the conductor, focusing the attention on the conductor and the performance of the music. He conveyed dynamics, showed the use of the left hand and various kinds of conducting techniques that might be taught in just a simple situation of having the children clap a rhythm.

In summarizing the teaching methods, basically it was felt that more varied types of methods might be employed. Perhaps the lecture method seemed inappropriate for any length of time. The areas that need support are vocal music and general music, especially music appreciation and general musical understanding.

Very little regarding the vocal problems of elementary school children and methods of improving vocal production was included in the workshops observed, although admittedly singing is at the heart of most elementary school music programs.

In many cases the primary conception of music appreciation seems to be playing a record for the children. It would be advisable that some of workshop might be devoted specifically to the listening experience and the ways that it might be utilized to generate general music understanding and appreciation, and contribute to the development of skills.

4. Organization and Presentation

Most of the workshops were fairly well organized as isolated entities. Effort could be made to insure that all of the participating teachers would be able to attend each of the workshops. Inquiries as to the most convenient time for the participants might make it possible to have all teachers attend one workshop, thus avoiding duplication of the workshops. This would enable the Board to make effective use of staff in team teaching so that each specialty is treated in depth.

Developing a sequence in growth from the orientation, to the workshops, to the final workshop, could, perhpas, even culminate in some kind of program or concert demonstrating basic, simple skills that the participants had learned through the series of workshops.

It should be noted that the Board of Education, in the original scheme of the workshops, intended the series to include twice as many workshops so that a sequence might have been established. This series which was to extend into summer but was not organized or implemented for lack of funds.

The instrumental workshops at Lefferts Junior High and O'Shea Junior High seemed well organized. They were designed to cover the subject of junior high instrumental programs regarding the selection of sutdents, the problems encountered in scheduling the facilities needed, the materials needed, the types of instruments needed, the actual development of instrumental techniques, and the ways in which to make entire instrumental program develop and grow to relate to the individual student. This seems to be a part of the program that has not been clarified thoroughly: whether these workshops are intended to reach the secondary level of school as well as the elementary, or whethet it is to be exclusively elementary levels. The workshop was well-paced at O'Shea Junior High to the extent that the involvement of the participants was quite thorough. They responded well, and the questions and discussion at the end revealed an intense interest in developing an instrumental program. At Lefferts the pacing was somewhat different, most of the time being devoted to the selection of students for the instrumental program and the general overview of the problems the teachers would encounter organizing a program. There was only about 10 minutes devoted to questions and discussion.

Regarding the overall organization of the workshop program, it appeared that there had been a break in communications between the persons responsible for the designing and turning out of the project proposals and those who actually set up and conducted the workshops. There appeared to be a lack of knowledge of these project proposals in considering the areas of innovations in content, different teaching techniques, and the greater background in musical skills for the non-public school teachers. In addition, in the overall program there seemed to be inconsistincy between the persons setting up the programs and the specific program procedures specified in the project description, which included the establishment of three-day institutes, Saturday institutes and summer institutes, as well as intervisitation programs between the public and non-public school teachers. The summer elementary schools were to operate so that the non-public school teachers could watch experienced music teachers in practice.

In each workshop an agenda was presented to the teachers which they could follow. The agenda determined the direction and pace for the workshop. However, it was clear that in many cases the agenda might be made more relevant and pertinent to the teacher involved in teaching music to the educationally-deprived child in the non-public school.

5. Materials

Among the materials provided was the agenda which presented an overview to the workshop. In addition to this there were also outlines dealing with an instrumental program, and musical aptitude tests which provided a key to the selection of students into the music programs, the vocal programs and the instrumental programs. In addition, a list of songs was provided showing the various limitation of range and how these might be applied to both the vocal and the instrumental programs. Outlines on how to conduct rehearsals were introduced with certain suggestions on how to save precious minutes in the rehearsals. These materials pertain basically to the development of musical skills and are not general suggestions for developing music understanding or basic concepts.

Therefore, perhaps it would be appropriate to suggest that recordings be suggested which would contain the masterpieces of music literature and a teacher's guide, such as those presented in The Adventures in Music series. Some suitable basic music series text could be suggested to supplement these recordings. The listening experiences should be developed to permeate the entire music program.

In an instrumental workshop presenting an overview of the instrumental program the overview seemed too general to really be of use to the participants. It would have been of value to the participants to receive at that time bibliographies, lists of materials, sources of materials, to which they could refer later.

It would have value for the participants to have seen at least one example of a band or class method book used in the elementary program. These method books might have been borrowed from the public schools. The participants were not able to see these except in a workshop at William O'Shea Junior High School when the workshop director simply held the book for a group of about forty or fifty to look at, turning to the first page showing the fingerings, then generally flipping through the pages. It would have been more valuable for the teachers to have had a copy in hand to examine. It would have been desirable for the teachers to have surveyed several methods of band literature or orchestra literature that can be used in classes for the elementary school, and for the workshop director to have discussed particular problems related to specific methods used. For example, some methods start very simply and stay too simple for too long a time. Other methods begin with extremely easy material and proceed to difficult material too quickly. The students are not allowed enough time to develop, and the teacher must provide supplementary materials. With the use of two methods or even three, sometimes a teacher can provide a well-rounded set of materials for the students.

Perhaps the best summary of the materials is that in view of the haste in which this program was implemented the materials were adequate. In a more completely developed series of workshops, the materials might be integrated in such a way as to be utilized in each of the workshops for a longer period of time. Basically, the materials seemed to be used for supplementary aids to the workshop rather than for direct usage in the classrooms. The obvious exception was the song-flute demonstration where the material was used directly with the participants reading directly from the songbooks while playing the song flutes.

It should be noted that the title of this program implied a teacher training program. However, the nature of the three workshops, due to the limitation of time, and lack of follow-through in non-public school teacher observation of experienced music teachers, essentially was an orientation program, rather than a teacher-training program.

6. Participation

One workshop met in a bandroom of a junior high school. It was somewhat small for the number of participating teachers present. There was not enough room for the demonstrator to comfortably walk around the room offering assistance to the participants during the demonstration of the violin. It was difficult for the participants to leave their seats to get the instruments. The participating teachers were seated in such a way as to receive little benefit from individual instruction given to others. They might have been seated facing each other in two groups so when one person was given instructions, or one person demonstrated a good point, the whole group could have benefited from the individual instruction. The attire the participating teachers were wearing made it difficult for one sitting in the back to see what was being done in the way of individual instruction to a person sitting in the front row.

In one teacher-training demonstration, the demonstrator was aided by an assistant. Both the demonstrator and the assistant were proficient violinists and as the demonstrator presented the lesson, the assistant would walk between the rows of chairs and help individual students. This succeeded with the large group situation and could be developed in further workshops. This approach was not used in the song flute demonstration. Consequently some people learned the wrong fingering for certain notes and continued for some time playing in an incorrect manner. With an experienced musician as a workshop assistant this problem could be overcome.

Regarding the two lecture demonstrations at Lefferts Junior High and O'Shea Junior High, both instrumental lectures, the facilities were adequate except for the fact that there might have been a clipboard or some sort of pad provided for those who wished to take notes, since there were no desks. Extremely heavy rain and uncomfortable humidity made it necessary to open the windows during the Lefferts Junior High lecture. The room was located on Empire Boulevard, and the traffic interfered to a great degree with the teachers sitting in the back of the room as to whether they could hear the lecturer at all times. The arrangement of the group was basically a typical lecture classroom.

The personality of both demonstrators at the instrumental lectures was such as to encourage the teachers to participate in the few activities provided, such as rhythmic activities, reading activities, and the opportunity to ask questions. It was very evident that the teachers felt free to participate in this manner.

The greatest success and involvement was attained in groups where the participant had the opportunity to actively participate in many different musical experiences.

7. Conclusion

The evaluation team observed four workshops. It was felt in discussion that the nature of the workshops varied greatly. For example, in some workshops there was a great deal of activity and involvement of the teachers in various kinds of activities stimulating a great deal of interest. In workshops utilizing lecture techniques the audience participation was at a low level although the interest remained high. The extreme variance of the workshops make it difficult to draw any kind of general conclusion other than it appears the workshops directly involving participants in various musical activities seemed to have more success and relate more directly to the problems that the teachers might encounter than did the strictly lecture type of presentation.

Participants in the program should be consulted regarding their needs and interests pertaining to the programs in the non-public schools. These objectives would be utilized in a series of workshops that would begin with a beginning orientation workshop. This would be followed by workshops that would be a series of experiences directly related to the goals stated specifically as the objectives. The workshops might lead to a performance or a series of performances by the participating teachers allowing them to demonstrate the skills and abilities, that they had developed. This does not have to be a concert in the traditional sense. It might be in the form of a demonstration or a semi-workshop held by the participating teachers in which they actually taught a lesson or gave a demonstration of techniques. The participating teachers should have an opportunity to evaluate their own progress as well as evaluate the program itself. It should be done in such a way that they could freely express their opinion about their achievement and the organization of the workshop itself. The workshop director and administrators might be aided by the development of an instrument for evaluation of the program in order that they can determine to what extent they have achieved the goals indicated at the beginning of the workshop.

Many of the teachers attended duplicate workshops. The series of three workshops were scheduled at two different meeting times and three different places in order to provide some opportunity for all of the teachers to attend at least three workshops. As it turned out, some teachers attended more than three workshops. It might seem advisable to utilize the nine workshops in covering more subject matter rather than duplicating the topics. Several teachers who attended both the Lefferts Junior High instrumental demonstration and the O'Shea Junior High instrumental demonstration received essentially the same agenda, the same outline, and the same approach.

On an overall basis it would seem that the program has been very worthwhile. However, it seems that one of these sessions cannot be considered an end in itself. The workshops cannot produce a competent instrumental teacher without a great deal of supplementary study.

More coherence between the individual workshops would have provided a more useful format for this program. The general scope and limitations of the workshops is inherent in the fact that only three topics could be considered at this time. This limitation therefore could not develop a program for teacher training; rather it would be orientation toward a music program.

The participants were never certain how they would use the information offered in the instrumental sessions. The questions that seemed to persist was: Will the non-public schools actually hire music teachers, or will music teachers be provided by the public schools? Will separate funds be provided to implement music programs in non-public schools? Will the student enrichment program continue to be conducted in the public schools? Therefore, it would seem that the purpose of the workshop should be either as a training ground for the non-public school teachers or as an orientation to the problems of implementing music programs, should the non-public schools decide to implement a music program. This should be decided and made clear to the people participating in the program.

The directors selected to lead the workshops were competent in their subject areas. The material presented was valuable; however, it was limited in scope and effectiveness.

Four recommendations are offered for improving the program. First, the primary objective of the workshops should be the presentation of general principles of teaching music. Those general principles should be stressed which have long term applicability in the development of musicianship in the classroom situation.

Second, it is recommended that the workshop be extended into a series of workshops so that adequate content, objectives, and continuity may be achieved. Third, the non-public school teacher should have an opportunity to observe the public school teacher in action in the classroom so that they can see the techniques being applied. Fourth, the non-public school teachers should have the opportunity to teach music in their own classrooms under the guidance of a music supervisor for an extended period of time. These recommendations actually are included in the project proposal. Therefore, the project proposal should be more closely examined, more carefully defined, and thoroughly implemented.

On balance, considering the lateness of implementation and the lack of precedence for such a program, this pilot program must be considered a basically acceptable and successful effort.

Evaluation by Participants

Ratings by Participants. Ratings on eleven aspects of the music program were available from 57 evaluation questionnaires returned, with responses. This represents 35% of the total enrollment. (About 50% of the questionnaires sent out were returned, but not all in time to be processed for this report.

Figures in parenthesis after the headings indicate items in the questionnaire to which the ratings refer. Percentages indicate proportion of participants bestowing the respective rating. (Totals somewhat above or below 100% on occasional items result from ordering the percentages to whole numbers, eliminating decimals.)

1. Facilities for participation by teachers (1a)

Good to excellent	49%
Moderately adequate	42%
Inadequate	9%

2. Physical arrangements of workshops (2)

Good to excellent	45%
Moderately satisfactory	46%
Inadequate	8%
No response	2%

3. Clarity of presentations (5)

Very clear	80%
Moderately clear	18%
Not clear	2%

4. Appropriateness of content (11)

Almost all appropriate	51%
About half appropriate	38%
Very little appropriate	6%
No response	5%

5. Allowance for individual differences (12)

All variations allowed for	44%
Moderate amount of flexibility	39%
No flexibility	13%
No response	5%

6. Harmony of workshop objectives with school objectives (16)

Almost completely the same	49%

6. (continued)

Some disagreement	43%
No agreement	4%
No response	4%

7. Addition to teacher's skills (19)

A great deal added	26%
Moderate addition	62%
Very little added	11%
No response	4%

8. Proportion of content applicable in teacher's school situation (21)

All or almost all	36%
About half	58%
Very little	2%
No response	5%

9. Degree of implementation of teacher's needs (22)

Completely implemented	17%
Moderately implemented	59%
Very little implemented	13%
No response	11%

10. Specific relationship of content to needs of the disadvantaged child (31)

Completely and specifically related	44%
Moderately related--as much related to needs of all children	40%
Not related	8%
No response	9%

11. General evaluation of workshop sessions in this subject (34)

Good to excellent	80%
Moderately good	12%
Of little or no value	4%
No response	4%

It is to be noted that about half the participants who returned the questionnaires saw some disagreement between the apparent objectives of their schools; relatively few believed that a great deal had been added to their skills; a majority perceived as useful in their situations about hald of what had been presented; most saw their needs as only moderately implemented; and less than half thought that the content of the workshops was particularly related to the disadvantaged child. Yet most assessed the workshops as a whole at a high level of excellence.

Responses on Open-ended Items

Situation, qualifications and motivation of participants. Information relevant to this topic is available from tow sources: a one page questionnaire filled out by participants at a monitored session, and returns from the major evaluation questionnaire sent to almost all participants.

From a short questionnaire, filled out by 38 persons present at a session on instrumental music, we find the following:

Grades taught - 50% taught the first three grades; 47% taught the seventh and eight grade. Many taught more than one grade.

Music in classroom - 53% taught music in their classrooms.

Equipment - The largest number - 26% - had records available. Only three teachers had rhythm instruments and only five had music books. 18% of the respondents had nothing. Many did not respond to this question.

Services of music specialist - 39% reported the services of a

Support for music program - 50% felt the music program was not adequately supported. 58% felt the music program was not adequately funded.

Time devoted to music - 58% reported the time devoted to music as one-half hour to one hour per week.

Organized music program - 39% reported no organized music program. 50% of the reachers reported they felt comfortable teaching music in the classroom.

Organized music program - 39 % reported no organized music program. 50% of the teachers reported they felt comfortable teaching music in the classroom.

Areas of special interest and importance. 18% were interested in instrumental music; 13% in choral music. In relating to objectives of music programs for children, 55% thought music appreciation was most needed.

Relevant to this item, some parallel information from the major evaluation questionnaire is of interest. Forty-eight individuals ranked 10 music areas in order of importance, for future workshops. They emerged in the following order:

1. Music reading for classroom vocal music - 46%
2. Music appreciation - 37%
3. Group singing in assemblies - 37%
4. Use of the song flute - 31 %
5. Choral directing - 30%
6. Singing and playing folk music - 25%
7. Constructing rhythm instruments - 21%
8. Learning to play and teach string instruments - 15%
9. Learning to play and teach hand instruments - 15%
10. Musical composition - 4%

(It will be noted that instrumental and orchestral music ranked relatively low, when compared with other foci of interest.)

Training in music of participants present at one session, 68% reported "some" training in music, and 10% had had extensive training.

From the sample of 48 who returned evaluation questionnaires, the following picture emerges:

no previous training - 17%
some previous training - 35%
extensive previous training - 28%
professionals in music - 12%

With this enormous range in background and skills, it is clearly necessary to offer training at different levels for greatest effectiveness. Alternatively, necessary skill levels might be indicated before registration so that the available places might be filled by those likely to derive the greatest benefit from the program.

Motivation for most of the respondents was interest in increasing musical skills useful in teaching. Only one reported coming because directed to do so.

Physical conditions. Relatively few complaints were made about physical conditions. There were most notable:

the last session too crowded
back seats did not permit good reception
one blackboard was unsatisfactory
desks of tables needed for note-taking

Opportunity for participation: About half the participants felt they had had enough opportunity to participate. Others said the groups were too large, more time was needed, they were not able to try the rhythm melody instruments. The programs involving the song flutes, the violins, and the use of a record to learn a song provided for most participation, apparently.

Changes and additions desired:

1. More consideration for those without musical training. About 25% of these respondents had difficulty in understand the lectures.
2. More participation and use of instruments; less time devoted to verbal presentation.
3. More sessions on one topic.
4. Intensive instruction in performance.
5. A course in methods of teaching music.
6. Demonstrations with classes of children.
7. More realistic sessions relevant to disadvantaged schools and disadvantaged children.

8. More attention to individuals; smaller groups.
9. Grade level presentations.
10. More sessions on specialized topics such as choral work, teaching musical instruments, orchestra, use of rhythm instruments with songs.
11. More materials for older children - high school level.
12. More audience participation in determining topics to be presented.
13. More follow-up for the lectures.
14. Have specific materials for kindergarten and primary grades.
15. More on music appreciation.
16. More on movement of music.
17. Singing games and dances.
18. More on home-made instruments.
19. Review of music basics, keys, note-reading, etc.
20. More on conducting, singing, by grade levels.
21. Earlier and more informative communications about program.
22. Entrance test and follow-up evaluation should be part of program.
23. Help in getting access to cultural activities, such as public schools, have, with free tickets.
24. More sessions, more time, less covered at one session.

Most Useful Items: Learnings of most immediate value included the following:

1. Choral and classroom singing
2. Use of records to teach songs
3. Rhythm band instruments
4. Song flute

Special Utility for Disadvantaged Children. Most respondents perceived no specialized utility for the disadvantaged in this area. A few mentioned information about inexpensive materials, making the disadvantaged feel part of the culture, furnishing materials for the children.

Relevance to Parochial Schools. Most participants felt the sessions on instrumental and orchestral music completely irrelevant, unless the Board of Education planned to provide instruments and teachers. Even then, many would not have space to store the instruments. Lack of funds, facilities, equipment, space, time and skill are mentioned factors interfering with applying with applying the suggestions of the program to the parochial school situations.

Despite the shortcomings mentioned above, 71% of the respondents said they would like to participate in another training program in music, even without remuneration. About 10% would only come for advanced or specialized work. Others mentioned qualifications such as "if specifically and directly helpful," "if help with special problems is given," "if location is convenient."

This may be explained by the high degree of professional capability exhibited by the instructors and perceived by the participants and by the high level of interest generated by most of the sessions - (only one session on rote singing and one orchestral session were faulted on these two items). It is clear that for increased effectiveness in the future, there must be more preplanning, two-way communication with the prospective participants, and more consideration given to different levels of skill, different grade-level interests and different specialization of interests. It is to be hoped that the handicap of hurried planning and execution will not be imposed on future programs.

ART

Content and Extent of Program:

The program in art education covered three areas: 1) creative drawing, 2) creative crafts using paper and 3) creative crafts in stitching, puppetry and papier-mache. Four equivalent series of three sessions each were offered. One session dealing with each area was monitored. The three equivalent sessions on each art area were not necessarily identical with the one monitored.

The enrollment for all art meetings was 427. Eighty three individuals attended six sessions, one series offered in May-June and another offered the last three weeks of June. One hundred and fifty seven schools were represented.

Evaluation by Consultants:

Four consultants in art education made up the team which monitored the sessions, collected in-session information from participants, and interviewed the coordinator of the project.

Drawing

Workshop

Organizational Procedure

1) Philosophical orientation was provided, including the importance of drawing as a universal means of expression, and the relationship of drawing to other art ectivities.
2) Participants were divided into 3 groups for the orientation and work sessions.
3) Materials distributed
4) Workshop period
5) Evaluation
6) Participant questionnaires

Specific Activities Involved

1) Orientation
   A) Exposition of a drawing philosophy, through explanation of the philisophy used in the elementary schools of New York City.
   B) Resources for better understanding of children's drawing through investigation of actual children's art works, and through reference to the publication, Creative and Mental Growth, by Viltor Lowenfeld.
   C) The role of the teacher in the development of themes appropriate to the child's developmental experiences, via stress on the teachers obligation to stimulate each child to maximum production, and the value of evaluation.
   D) A practical discussion of a few principles observed in two-dimensional creation, including overlapping, size, placement, and color.

Distribution of Materials

Distribution occured after orientation.

Actual Working Periods

Working periods were fifty minutes long which approximates the amount of time usually provided for children. Working periods were enhanced by continuing evaluations and individual attention provided by the master teachers. Finally, there was a summary evaluation, followed by the participants filling out the questionnaire.

Key Areas of Emphasis During the Workshop

1) Emphasis given to the necessity of art experiences for all children, and the teachers obligation to structure these experiences.
2) Planning as an integral part of problem solving, including the necessity for teachers to convey to students the importance of planning for a successful art product, and the condition of drawing being understood as both a pleasurable and intellectual activity.
3) Attention to principles such as color and placement, with teachers being made aware that students will begin to question these considerations.
4) Motivation and the enhancement of children's response on paper; motivation helps to evoke mental images, and the value of questioning.
5) Evaluation and the importance of both medial and summary evaluations.

Quality of Visual Presentations

There was an excellent display of children's creative drawings which motivated the participants to questions directed to the lecturer concerning various aspects of drawing.

Quality of Demonstrator's Presentation

The master teachers demonstrated with appropriate examples of children's drawings, and were very alert to the needs of the group they were addressing (elementary teachers with limited experience in art)

Interest of the Participants

The participants ahd a great interest in wanting to know how to present a drawing lesson to students and seemed to have a sincere interest in children, both of which led to heavy questioning.

Participant's Comprehension

The participant's work, growing terminology, and apparent understanding indicated there were varying degrees of understanding of the subject.

Communication of Master Teachers

There was variation among the personalities of the lecturers. The participants enjoyed listening to the lecturers. The communication skill of the presentors was excellent.

Apparent Objectives of this Workshop

1) To give classroom teachers, with little or no background in art, a sound philosophy to follow when approaching the problem of instructing children to draw creativily.

2) To aquaint the participants with the real problems children face in drawing by having them become involved with a problem in drawing.
3) To aquaint them with examples of successful crayon drawings by children so they could intelligently establish aesthetic criteria.
4) To emphasize the importence of the art experience for all children, illustrated partly through proper motovation and evaluation.

Success in Meeting Apparent Objectives

The workshop was excellent.

Physical Facilities

The facilities provided enough room to work and were appropriate for drawing. The facilities resembled those found in many classrooms and therefore offered a good, practical, situation for the master teachers to work in.

Workshop Materials

Crayons, cray-pas, chalk and 12 X 18 manila paper were provided. This seemed an intelligent and appropriate decision since most elementary teachers encourage youngsters (and the youngsters are most willing) to express and interpret their experience in this media.

Appropriateness of Workshop Topic

The workshop topic was very appropriate.

Consideration of Approach by Grade Level

The teacher's orientation stressed the importance of understanding the differences in skills, abilities, and interests of children at various developmental levels. The participants were made aware of the benefit of familarizing themselves with the developmental stages and materials and skills appropriate for them.

Stress of Individuality in Children's Art

The orientation by all master teachers stressed the importance of recognizing and encouraging individuality of production.

Comments and Other Observations

The master teachers were extremely competent and knowledgable about creative drawing. Their understanding of elementary children and their desire for, and manner of artistic expression, was knowing.

Their ability to relate to the participants, enabled them to share this knowledge and understanding.

2. Designing and Constructing With Paper

1. Organizational Procedure

    a. Registration: 4:00 P.M. - 4:14 P.M. (14 mins.)
    b. Workshop (Preliminaries): 4:14 P.M. - 4:23 P.M. (9 mins.)
    c. Film strip: 4:23 P.M. - 4:50 P.M. (27 mins.)

    Total: 50 mins.

2. Specific Activities Involved - (Time)

    a. Preliminaries to opening:
        (1) Explanation of questionnaire (sec: 2b)
    b. Explanation of Workshop procedures, teaching guides: introduction of coordinators (sec:2b)
    c. Film strip: "Creative Designing with Paper" (Sec: 2c)
    d. Anticipation of materials problem and suggested solutions - 25 mins.
    e. Workshop (working period) - 45 mins.

    Total: 70 mins.

TOTAL TIME: 2 hours

3. Key Areas of emphasis in workshop:

    The workshop members were made aware of the importance of the recognition and utilization of student interest; the importance of the proper adaptation of aesthetic problems to the children's developmental stage; the necessity of conscientious planning of truly creative experiences; and the necessity of medial and summary evaluations.

    A. Recognition and Utilization of Student Interest

        1. Attention must be given to the child's desire to manipulate paper and related materials and to handle various tools.

        2. Both workshop director and film emphasized this important consideration.

    B. The Importance of Experimental Approach as an Introduction to Creative Paper Design at all Stages of Development

    C. The Importance of the Presentation of a Structured Lesson

        1. The presentation of the problem.
        2. Motivation for the lesson.
        3. Direction in the selection of materials.

a. In an experimental construction, the child should be encouraged to see that the weight of the paper might help to determine its use, etc.

4. Work period - The teacher guides them individually.
5. Evaluation - The importance of evaluation as an instrument to further student understanding.

   a. To pull together the aims and objectives of the lessons and summarize the art learnings.
   b. Each participant in workshop given a sample list of "evaluation questions" for future use with students.
   c. During workshop period, medial evaluation given.
      (i) Unfortunately, the time element precluded workshop member participation.

4. Quality of Visual Presentations

A. Filmstrip - "Creative Designing With Paper"

1) (27 mins.): color; accompnaying narration.

2) Film choice excellent. The portrayal of children (X-6) working creatively in a regular classroom was a most appropriate demonstration; the members of the workshop were afforded the opportunity of seeing how both simple and complex construction could be made by children in a classroom situation.

3) A thorough explanation of materials (sources, uses) was given; suggestions for the adaptation of certain materials to specific grade levels was offered.

4) The problems encountered in classroom management, methods and procedures in the implementation of basic skills (e.g., cutting, tearing, scoring, etc.) at each stage of developmental growth (e.g., manipulative; intuitive, etc.) and the determination of appropriate experiences for various grade levels reviewed and practical suggestions made for the realization of these objectives.

5) Other notable features of the filmstrip:

   a. The problem of aiding the child to move from two to three-dimensional thinking and visualization discussed - constructive suggestions made.

   b. Both individual and group experiences explored.

   c. The proper procedure for the conduction of an effective evaluation period mentioned.

B. Two and three-dimensional examples on display

1) A wide variety of two and three-dimensional projects, student-made, were on display (e.g., figures and animals, masks, baskets, hats,

booklets, realistic and imaginative constructions). The examples provided tangible evidence in the support of the imaginative and utilitarian possibilities of paper creations.

C. It should be noted that the cafeteria decorations suggested an additional use of paper; two and three-dimensional posters in support of "O.O." nominees, caught the attention of numerous workshop members.

5. Communication skills of Representatives from the Board of Education

Mrs. Dock and Mrs. Hochman, both master teachers, representing the New York City Board of Education, were instrumental in the pre-planning of the workshop activity and were instrumental in sustaining the high level of interest.

By enumerating any number of examples of excellent paper projects and contrasting these examples with a listing of hackneyed paper productions, Mrs. Dock established definite interest among the participants and they were anxious to learn of additional ways to approach the problem of paper construction. She called their attention to the need of all children to first experiment with paper to discover its possibilities.

Methodically, she named and held up for viewing each item of material offered for workshop exploration; she mentioned the possibilities and limitations of most items. Possibly, a portion of this presentation could have been shortened to compensate for the loss of time accrued during registration.

Mrs. Dock and Mrs. Hochman mingled freely among the participants, offering guidance and encouragement. Her medial evaluation reminded the participants of their responsibility to continually ask judgmental questions of the projects as they worked; it was pointed out that they should have their students follow a similar approach as they manifested their creative ideas.

6. Depth of Involvement

The level of interest and participation appeared to be high. For example, when the group was told that they had only 15 minutes left to work, a general sigh of disappointment was audible.

7. Facilities

A. Ample tables provided for working and were arranged in a manner that permitted easy passage between.

B. Inadequacy: Not all participants could remain seated and view file-columns and people seated in front rows blocked view from rear of room. Ventilation was poor.

8. Demonstration's Appropriateness

A. The visual examples included appropriate projects for various grade levels.

B. The file, of course, discussed any number of experiences suitable for each grade (K-6)

9. Materials

A. More than satisfactory. Materials remaining after the workshop session were given to participants

B. Materials: rulers, wooden splints, papers - chrome, construction, metallic; tag board, pipe cleaners, manille envelopes, cardboard tubes, paper plates, yarn, rubber cement, Scissors

10. Appropriateness oi Topic

A. Very well adapted to elementary students interests, needs and skill levels.

11. Distinctions for Each Grade Level

A. The examples on display, the suggestions made by the films and the suggestions offered by the cooperating and master teachers, furnished a great number of projects suitable for specific grade levels.

B. Teachers furnished with a "Teaching Guide" suggesting differentiated paper activities for grades: 4,5,6; K-2, 3-4

1. The manuals were illustrated (published, 1960).

12. Individuality

Individuality of approach was encouraged by workshop director and file.

The cooperating teachers offered as much individual help as was needed and accepted.

13. Objectives

All categories were touched with the possible exception of imparting knowledge of artists.

Materials distributed for future use consisted of (1) problems in three-dimensional paper-craft suitable for grades from kindergarten through grade 8; (2) evaluation questions for judging products; (3) an outline of all stpes in basic art experiences in painting.

3. Stitchery, Puppetry, Paper Mache

Quality of Presentations (Positive and negative comments are grouped for each of the three media areas, with general comments concluding the evaluation)

STITCHERY

Positive

1) A dynamic speaker, perhaps the strongest in the group of presentors.
2) Most important everyone present participated in her demonstration and enjoyed.
3) All were supplied with an envelope containing stichery supplies.
4) Participants afforded time to complete steps presentor demonstrated.
5) Presentor occasionally assisted individual participants.
6) Presentor repeated questions from floor over loud speaker so all could hear and benefit.
7) Energetic and lively presentation.
8) Presentor responsive to audience.
9) A large number of pupil examples were distributed at the end of the presentation.
10) Presentor called for open ended questions and answers.
11) Good timing and subjects highly responsive.
12) Presentor stressed inventiveness and creative use of materials.
13) Supplies were simple and ample for participants time.
14) Presentation adaptive to most levels.
15) Presentor stressed individuality.

Negative

1) Examples too small to be seen by all participants.
2) While she stressed creativity and inventiveness, presentor did not develop same in participants usage of materials. Designs varied only in content and little in techniques with media.

   Most participants used thread in a linear drawing manner.
3) Examples stimulating variety of techniques and materials used at the end of lecture. Might have been more stimulating in beginning.

Negatives (Continued)

4) Use of presentor at slides could have helped considerably · projector and screen were available.

5) Participants displayed examples but presentor, while emphasizing inventiveness, showed little more than variety in-------designs .

6) Packet of supplies limited to cost items. Could have included items now available in disadvantaged areas, and with a greater variety.

7) Presentor might have made a greater effort to show the participants that a tapestry is more than merely drawing with thread.

PUPPETRY

Positive

1) Good examples - good voice - excellent in experience and varied designs.

Negative

1) Participants excluded from activities.

2) Presentor relied too heavily on a lecture approach.

3) Participants most sympathetic but became restless.

4) Presentation highly directive and questionable to contemporary philosophy of art education (Sought to develop 3-D from previous 2-D model originally unassociated with activity).

5) Highly directive methodology restrictive of ideas usually discovered naturally by children during such an experience. Presentor tended to categorize puppets in a manner which would restrict the student's development of physical movements and interpretation.

6) A short presentation exemplary of presentor's main ideas would have been helpful and stimulating.

7) Attention to detail would have been better by use of visuals.

PAPER-MACHE

1) Positive - good use of visuals which included photos of children involved in process.

2) Presentor specified appropriate levels.

3) While presentor relied exclusively on visuals and lecture, she was able to keep their attention especially difficult in this spot on the program and in a rather stifling room.

4) Presentor emphasized "How you get youngsters to develop their own ideas".

5) Simple and direct steps appropriate to audience, Presentor did not belabor details on minor points.

6) Emphasized sharing activity and group values developed by such experiences.

Negative

1) Photos of children working indicated facilities and supplies beyond the means of schools involved.

2) No opportunity for audience participation.

General Comments:

Negative

1) Room difficult for demonstrations but appropriate for workshop activities.

2) Only one presentor out of 3 allowed for group participation in a "workshop".

3) Inadequate staffing. Assistants too few to cover large number of participants.

4) Room temperature so uncomfortably warm.

Positive

1) Excellent enthusiasm by both participants and presentors.

The respective meetings were rated by the evaluation team on the basis of objectives derived from the project description. The rating was on a five-point scale, with 5 representing the highest value.

	Drawing	Paper Craft	Stitchery, etc.
1) The promotion of children's understanding, awareness and appreciation of beauty, art forms and aesthetic qualities in spite of the handicaps in these areas associated with living in a socio-economically disadvantaged environment.	5	4	2
2) The development of children's visual perception and appreciation of color, proportion, design, and texture.	5	4	2
3) The development of children's skills in the use of various materials, tools, and processes through the provision of art experiences in a variety of media so that they may be helped to release their creative urges through individual experimentation with various art materials.	4	5	4
4) Enhancement of children's powers to think independently and creatively and to communicate their	5	4	3

		1. Drawing	2. Paper Craft	3. Stitchery etc.
	thoughts and feelings about art.			
5)	The stimulation of children's reading about art and artists.	1	1	1
6)	Helping to meet the interests of disadvantaged children.	5	2	2
7)	Contributing to solving classroom problems.	5	4	1
8)	Helping to deal with the far-reaching problems of disadvantaged children	2	1	1
9)	Contributing innovations in content and additional teaching skills.	3	4	3

Rotating of the three workshops combined in terms of the above objectives, were as follows:

Objective 1 - 4
Objective 2 - 4
Objective 3 - 4
Objective 4 - 4
Objective 5 - 1
Objective 6 - 3
Objective 7 - 3
Objective 8 - 1
Objective 9 - 3

The evaluation team estimated that four proposal objectives were met adequately. The objective concerned with stimulation of children's reading about art and artists was not met.

The workshops were judged very average, if not deficient, in meeting the particular needs of disadvantaged children, helping the participants solve their unique classroom problems, and utilization of innovative approaches to teaching art.

The workshop personnel were judged to be knowledgeable, interesting and energetic. In two cases, quality leadership and instruction were exhibited. The following overall ratings were given to organizational, logistic, and other aspects of the program.

Organization -- 4
Quality of Visual Presentations - 4
Consideration Given to Children's Developmental Level - 5
Individuality of Child Art - 4
Workshop Personnel - 4
Workshop Facilities - 2
Workshop Materials (Type and Availability) - 5

Program Communication - 5
Program Liason - 5
Workshop Media - 5
Fedback of Information - 5

Notwithstanding certain negative evaluations, mentioned earlier, and the time limitation imposed on the program and on the evaluation, the evaluation team rated the internal and procedural characteristics of the program (sub-criteria above) at 4 to 5 - a rating indicating a high degree of excellence. The lack of adequate facilities is partially understandable, though not desirable, and did not seem seriously to impede results.

Evaluation by Participants

Qualifications, motivations and other background information about participants

Information for this heading is unusually extensive for the art workshops because the evaluation team gathered and analyzed this information from 240 teachers who were present at three workshops. Excerpts from the report of the evaluation team are quoted below.

Grades and Class sizes:

There is a full spread of grade levels taught by the participants. Grades 1 and 4 appear to be the grades most taught. It would appear difficult for any single workshop to service the precise methodological needs of so varied a children's age-range. Over half of the participants taught several grade levels however, which may have contributed to the logic of the workshop design.

Grade Levels Usually Taught by Participants

Grade	Number of Participants
Kdg.	16
1	60
2	44
3	41
4	56
5	52
6	45
7	46
8	35

Many participants taught more than one grade level and the data reflect this condition. 236 participants answered this question.

With 197 participants reporting, the average size of the classes taught by the participants was 44.4 students. This number reduced to 42.3 when specialist teachers were eliminated. Classes of this size require special teaching methodology.

Art in Classrooms: 179 participants, out of 240 reporting, indicated they usually teach art in their own classrooms. Eighty-three participants, out of 240 reporting, indicated they have the services of an art supervisor or specialist. The data would tend to indicate that most of the participants do teach art, and they teach it without the aid of a specialist.

One hundred and forty one participants, out of 178 reporting, indicate the art program is not well supported, and 129 out of 139 reporting, indicate the art program is not well funded. Some participants did not answer these questions.

173 participants, out of 240 reporting, reported crayons and paper as the media they have available in their own classrooms. Tempera, poster, and transparent water colors, and colored paper, were reported as available by approximately 20% of the participants reporting. Other media available, in proportionally minor amounts, were clay, pastels, charcoal, cray-pas, felt pens, finger paint, ink, and colored tissue paper. The data would tend to indicate that the participants teaching art in their own classrooms, largely do so with crayons and paper.

With 185 participants reporting, the average number of hours devoted to teaching art per month was 3.8 hours. It can be assumed, on the basis of participants comments, that the 3.8 hours was often an estimate of scattered minutes, taught in conjunction with other subject areas using art as a service, or complementary discipline.

The data suggest that in the participant's own schools, the majority of art programs are not organized, and that the major lack of organized programs occurs in grades K - 6.

	Organized	
Grade Level	Yes	No
K-3	52	99
4-6	50	85
other	32	54

Of 227 participants reporting, 187 indicated there were no art services offered after school hours.

Encouraging proportion of participants (124 out of 193) indicated they felt comfortable teaching art in their own classrooms.

With 217 participants reporting, only 48 indicate they participate in some kind of art activity on their own. The range and level of these activities would obviously be extremely varied.

Art Areas of Greatest Interest:

The data tend to indicate that crafts and painting are the areas the participants would like to know more about.

Art Areas The Participants Would
Like to Know More About [1]

Crafts	74
Painting	63
Drawing	22
Sculpture	17
Design	12
History & Apprec.	5
Advertising	3

Many participants did not answer. Many answered more than once. The number of participants answering was 147. Asked to indicate in which, of fine areas related to program objectives they considered training most needed, they responded as follows:

Art Appreciation	100
Visual Perception	102
Art Skills	145
Independent Thinking Through Art	135
Knowledge About Art and Artists	44

[1] 240 participants reported. Many chose more than one area, which is reflected by the data.

Participant's Training in Art Education: with 240 participants reporting, 55, or 23% had no training in art education. Advanced training meant undergraduate work to many participants, although several had advanced degrees in art and art education. 185 participants had had some training in art education in advance of the workshops.

None	55
Some	164
Advanced Training	21

Although 23% may seem a small proportion, extended to the total workshops attendance, this would come to at least 100 people without previous art training. This seems a large enough number to deserve special consideration.

Motivations of participants:

Of 38 major evaluation questionnaires selected for detailed analysis, only one mentioned being directed to attend, all others stressed interest in learning new techniques and desire to improve skill.

Assessment by ratings:

Of the 238 major evaluation questionnaires sent out, 116 were returned with responses, in time to be tabulated for this report. (One hundred and twenty-one questionnaires, or 51% of those sent out, were returned, but some came too late for complete processing). The eleven ratings requested are summarized below in percentages of respondents selecting each level of assessment. (Totals of ratings sometimes add up to slightly less or slightly more than 100%; this is caused by rounding.)

1. Facilities for participation by teachers (1a)

Good to excellent	50%
Moderately adequate	39%
Inadequate	10%
No response	2%

2. Physical arrangements of workshops (2)

Good to excellent	31%
Moderately satisfactory	55%
Inadequate	12%
No response	1%

3. Clarity of presentations (5)

Very clear	74%
Moderately clear	25%
Not clear	0
No response	1%

4. Appropriateness of content (11)

Almost all appropriate	59%
About half appropriate	39%
Very little appropriate	0
No response	2%

5. Allowance for individual differences (12)

All variations allowed for	61%
Moderate amount of flexibility	33%
No flexibility	1%
No response	4%

6. Harmony of workshop objectives with school objectives (16)

Almost completely the same	49%
Some disagreement	41%
No agreement	4%
No response	5%

7. Addition to teacher's skills (19)

A great deal added	27%
Moderate addition	61%
Very little added	6%
No response	6%

8. Proportion of content applicable in teacher's school situation (21)

All or almost all	53%
About half	41%
Very little	3%
No response	2%

9. Degree of implementation of teacher's needs (22)

Completely implemented	26%
Moderately implemented	56%
Very little implemented	7%
No response	9%

10. Specific relationship of content to needs of the disadvantaged child (31)

Completely and specifically related	45%
Moderately related —as much related to needs of all children	43%
Not related	5%
No response	8%

11. General evaluation of workshop sessions in art (34)

Good to excellent	78%
Moderately good	16%
Of little or no value	0
No response	4%

It is to be noted that the proportion who found the presentations less than completely clear corresponds closely to the proportion noted earlier who have had no previous art training. The fact that less than half the participants see this training specifically linked to the disadvantaged child raises some question about the need for more clarification on this point —perhaps in the thinking of the presenting personnel as well as in communication to the participants. The fact that most teacher's needs were only moderately implemented, that almost half the teachers felt that only about half they learned was applicable to their school situations, that less than half perceived the objectives of the workshop and those of their schools to be in complete harmony, raises question about more effective implementation in the future. For details suggesting how this might be done, we turn to the responses to the opened questions on the evaluation questionnaire.

Responses to open-ended questions:

These responses came from 25 papers filled out by non-specialists teaching the full range of grades and representing all religious orientations and all locations from 12 questionnaires filled out by art teachers and professional artists; from 15 questionnaires filled out by individuals with no previous art training, and from 9 questionnaires filled out by people who attended six sessions, or an early and a later series. Scanning all the returns suggests that analyses of these covers most of the suggestions and criticisms made.

Physical condtions: The major difficulties were the following:

crowded conditions
pillars preventing clear view of demonstrations in one series
stationary microphone limiting movements of demonstrators
use of lap-boards in one series limiting freedom of participation
lack of access to water for clean-up
lack of facilities for neat and easy waste disposal

Opportunity for participation:

This was considered excellent for the series held in cafeteria but somewhat limited in the series held in the auditorium. The groups were too large in some instances for as much individual guidance as was needed. Sessions were too short to allow enough time for the less gifted or less well-trained to finish their projects in paper sculpture, papier-mache and needlecraft. No opportunity to participate in papier-mache work in the first series made that presentation of dubious value for those who could not take the second series. Longer sessions with more opportunity to work with the various media were desired by most respondents.

Changes and additions desired:

1. A course in art basics for those without previous training.
2. Consideration for the physical milieu in which art is likely to be taught in parochial schools; large, crowded classrooms without running water, with small, fixed, slanted desks, and little space to move around.

3. More and longer sessions; smaller classes
4. More specific grade-level projects and methods
5. More specific motivation for children, particularly in stitchery
6. Extension of topics to include clay modeling, fingerpainting, painting (watercolors, poster painting) use of charcoal and pastels, woodworking.
7. More intensive work on drawing, paper sculpture, puppetry
8. Training in crafts such as leathercraft, felt craft, beadwork, popstick crafts.
9. Earlier communication about the program
10. Information about facilities for gifted children
11. More stress on both the younger and the older child
12. Something on art appreciation and masters
13. Projects for homework, to be evaluated in class
14. Grouping teachers by skill levels, conditions of work at own schools, interests, grade levels taught or type of child population taught.

Even those who had had six sessions wanted more and longer sessions, more depth regarding the topics covered and a wider range of topics. If nothing else is possible, more intensive work in training particularly on figures in action, would be most valuable.

Most Useful Items:

Without question, the session on creative drawing was of greatest immediate use, particularly the use of chalk for first sketches and methods of blocking out drawings. Puppetry came second, with applications in a variety of academic areas. Paper sculpture was also mentioned.

Special Utility for Disadvantaged Children. As usual, only one or two participants spontaneously mentioned the disadvantaged when asked about the purposes of the workshops. When asked specifically about the connection between this training and the disadvantaged, the participants showed real sensitivity. Mentioned especially was the utility of the art medium for the inarticulate or bilingual child to help him express himself. One teacher even planned to use drawings as evidence of mastery of academic subject matter on required examinations. Others felt the disadvantaged particularly need the opportunity to feel achievement in creativity, to handle a variety of materials, to experience cultural activities which their homes lacked. In specifics, information about the variety of activities which could use waste materials or very inexpensive materials, was appreciated.

Congruence with Parochial Schools. Although general objectives of the program were considered to be harmonious with those of the schools, special conditions at the latter would attenuate the applicability of the contents of the programs. Most frequently mentioned were the lack of facilities, time, supplies, space, funds, and trained personnel. It was felt that the size of classes precluded giving the individual attention needed to make the art experience optimal. With cr wded academic schedules, art periods seemed impractical in many instances. Most participants, however, anticipated opportunities to use their new skills and knowledge in the service of a wide variety of subject matters. Uses in extra-curricular, summer and special occasion applications were also envisioned.

The suggestions or criticisms mentioned above were obviously not meant to denigrate the quality of the program. Most participants were extremely enthusiastic about it. Most respondents said they would participate in more programs of the same sort, even without remuneration. Their spontaneous comments were so extraordinarily enthusiastic that quotation seems to be the only way to convey their spirit. A few follow:

"In view of the limited amount of time alloted for this course, I felt it accomplished a great deal. If nothing else, it presented a new and systematic concept of art taught on the elementary level. One could not remain unaware that this philosophy of art is directed toward the personal fulfillment of the child through his own creativity. Although highly personalized, it is not without its own disciplines and norms. While still very inadequate in regard to terms and techniques, I am very enthusiastic about the total goals of this highly individualistic form of art. The dedication of those who gave the course was both exemplary and communicative. The hints given were practical and concrete. It was reassuring to know that these methods were practical and tested by experience. All in all, the experience was both enjoyable and enriching."

"The first session on Creative Art was very instructive and invigorating." "The team of teachers pointed out the basic as well as the essential facts in leading the child to creative work. The means of bringing out the best in the child, stimulated me to want to give every disadvantaged child a love for the art of creative drawing."

We know that the desirability of smaller classes has been appreciated by the Coordinator of this program. We suggest that some be planned specifically for those without any art background.

A list of frequently used terms and their meanings would be helpful.

Perhaps re-thinking the contents of the program is in order, with the objective of bringing them more realistically in line with conditions prevailing in the parochial schools. If it is known to be possible to use all media discussed in large and crowded classes, some time might be spent on training in the effective procedures. In any case, presentation without participation does not seem an effective use of time for these teachers.

A fairly large number of professionally trained art teachers seem to have been among the participants. A question might be raised about the inclusion of these individuals, with reference to the stated objectives of the project.

A broader offering of topics, based on the expressed preferences of the participants might be undertaken.

Three-hour rather than two-hour sessions would seem more satisfactory.

One topic per session, rather than two or three, would seem desirable for most participants.

A whole series on one topic, such as creative drawing, might well be offered as follow-up to the introductory series already given.

Some attention might be paid to the characteristics of disadvantaged children that might require adjustments in accepted methodology used mainly with the non-disadvantaged. Such consideration might have special relevance to kindergarten and the primary grades.

It might be helpful to include information about reducing costs of materials, and about the possibility of making art media, such as fingerpaints instead of buying them ready-made.

Which of the many needs in art education can be filled must be left in the hands of the very capable and dedicated supervisory staff of the Board of Education. This evaluation can only bring to their attention some of the more obvious ones, which they may have already perceived. In the presence of their magnificent performance under adverse conditions, one hesitates even to imply criticism by offering what are intended to be constructive suggestions.

SPEECH

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

Extent and content of program:

One-Day Institutes:

Each of the four one-day workshops had the following contents: two demonstrations, one in speech arts (choral speaking, dramatics, etc.) and one in developing listening skills; three talks, one on the speech clinic program, one on speech needs of the disadvantaged, and one on reading and speech. From 83 schools, there was a total of 215 participants: 35 in Queens, 47 in the Bronx, 108 in Brooklyn, and 25 in Manhattan.

May - June Program: Contents of the May - June sessions were as follows:

1. Speech and the problems of the disadvantaged child.
2. Speech as related to listening and reading.
3. Sounds of English--formation, difficulties, particulars.
4. Creative dramatics.
5. Group discussion.

The afternoon series had one additional session, devoted to demonstration lessons with children.

Attendance at the two series of workshops totalled 209 individuals, from 70 schools.

Parent Meetings: The parent meetings included talks on speech services, guidance for parents in relation to speech problems, development of speech, speech defects and speech faults, therapy procedures and referrals. There were also demonstrations of some choral speaking techniques. Materials given to the parents consisted of a mimeographed list of guidance reminders, books and booklets for parent use and records for auditory and training; also "The Stuttering Child" by Letitia Raubicheck, a four-paper leaflet. Accurate records of attendance at the parent meetings are not available to us because we could secure no official count. However, in the three parent meetings monitored by the evaluation team, 151 adults were present, and 21 children. (A fourth meeting was not monitored).

July Program: The July program consisted of 10 three-hour meetings, offering 20 presentations. Of these 6 were demonstrations and 14 were lectures. The lectures covered the following topics:

A profile of the disadvantaged child.

Psychological basis of language development.

Development of listening skills.

Development and improvement of voice sounds of English, a phonetic approach, linguistic approach to the communication problems of the disadvantaged child.

Speech problems related to dialect.

Speech improvement in relation to achievement of reading skills.

Choral speaking in the language art program.

Creative dramatics in the language arts program.

Speech in action: storytelling, oral reporting, group discussion.

Survey of speech services in public and non-public schools.

Oral interpretation of prose and poetry in the language arts program

The last two sessions of this program were not monitored. In the first eight sessions, only one demonstration used children; the others used adults who pretended to be children.

Materials supplied to the audience included bibliographies on the topics of the lectures, a list of ways to improve speech at home, and materials for use in choral speaking.

Our reports show 112 participants; official records were not available to us when this report was written. Seventy-nine schools were represented, of these, 47 were Jewish Parochial Schools.

Assessments by Consultants

One-Day Institutes: The one-day institutes took place on May 7 and May 14, before the evaluation team was operant. Descriptive assessments of these are based on interviews with supervisory personnel from the Board of Education who planned and executed them. Participants' reactions were available and are discussed below.

Each workshop had a different set of speakers, directors and coordinators. Each presented different sets of problems, the problems largely springing from the time pressures to start the program.

One coordinator had difficulty with internal communication. An organization meeting, planned to avoid repetition, etc., was poorly attended because it required the speakers to leave their regular work, which also exerted pressures. The objectives of the meetings derived from Board of Education directives, not from ascertained needs of the non-public schools. As a result of the communication difficulties, there was repetition in what the speakers covered. One speaker only addressed herself specifically to the needs of disadvantaged children, but almost exclusively to the Negro group.

Audience reaction was reported as favorable, but one individual dominated the question period.

The coordinator rated the meeting as very successful, but the consultant (who interviewed the coordinator, but was not present at the meeting) points out:

1. Attendance was poor.
2. Planning and topics were routine.
3. The presenting personnel need a better orientation to the unique problems of disadvantaged children and non-public schools.

In another one-day workshop, with attendance of 108, materials for distribution were in short supply. Children used in the demonstration could not be heard by the whole audience; the stationary microphone on stage was unsatisfactory for demonstration use--when the demonstrator moved from the microphone, she could not be heard by the audience.

On the positive side were the materials distributed to the teachers, and the visual displays: charts on listening, rexographed materials, monthly suggestions on teaching speech to the disadvantaged, a bibliography of books on teaching the disadvantaged.

The coordinator noted this workshop as "very successful" despite the difficulties with the demonstrations. Even he, however, thought there should have been more information about techniques used in the correction of common faults in articulation, to help teachers correct the common speech faults of some in the disadvantaged groups.

A third workshop had no difficulties with materials or auditorium. Secretarial help, however, was insufficient. There was no provision of labor for duplicating materials, nor was the budget sufficient for materials. Time and space for planning meetings also had to be donated, not having been covered in the budget.

In this instance, the "disadvantaged" children seem to have been conceived of mainly as Negro and Puerto Rican. Emphasis was on personality problems as they affected speaking rather than on speech patterns per se.

The presentation was judged as "very successful" by the coordinators. However, the one-day institute was believed to be less effective than a spread of three days for the same content.

The sessions seemed to have a beneficial impact judged by the following:

1. Request for a several-day workshop by one group.
2. An increase in the number of children referred to after-school speech centers after the Institutes.

Recommendations for change include compensation for planning time, more adequate compensation for instructors and supervisors, adequate provision of clerical services, time for pre-planning communication with parochial school personnel, more and shorter sessions.

The latter recommendation was implemented in subsequent programs.

Parent Meetings: Evaluations of individual meetings varied. Below we present the comments of the consultant who monitored the largest meeting.

Audience Analysis

The program started with only about ten parents present. Gradually other parents arrived, so that by 8 p.m. there were ninety people present. This would suggest that 7 p.m. is too early a starting time for parents, particularly women, who are involved in dinner chores at home. An 8 p.m. starting time seems more realistic.

Of the 90 people present about one third were men. Some parents brought very young children along with them, but they were extremely well behaved.

The group in attendance was cross-sectional in representation of ethnic backgrounds. There were Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Italians, Irish, Cubans, and Jews present. Many spoke with foreign accents and many hardly spoke English at all. They were well behaved and neatly dressed; it would be difficult to judge how many were economically disadvantaged.

The parents were attentive and polite during the two speeches but as soon as they were encouraged to ask questions the meeting disintegrated into a free-for-all. No one could be heard over the general noise and the speakers were unable to control the situation. Everyone was talking at once and everyone had many questions to ask.

Materials (Do's and Don'ts and mimeographed children's poems) were not passed out but placed on the stage and parents were told to help themselves. This led to absolute chaos and was ill advised.

Evaluation

This was a very enthusiastic group and quite a remarkable turnout for an occasion such as this. It is regrettable that so much time was spent on giving information that was either unnecessary or inappropriate. The material was presented pedantically, and oriented to the academic sophisticated person. At a first general meeting with parents of limited education and, in many instances, of limited knowledge of English, why is it necessary to discuss Van Piper's criteria of speech disorders, or to use such phrases as "filter it out," "auditory feedback," "hardly audible," etc.? The most serious fault was a lack of identification with parents from a low socioeconomic, poor linguistic environment. They failed to analyze their audience and to communicate what they needed and wanted to know.

The parents were bursting with questions. This was obvious when the speeches were over and dozens of hands shot up. Why did they have to sit through a lecture on what to do with a stuttering child when this problem concerns but the smallest fraction of our school population? There were many other, more pertinent issues, regarding common problems of spoken English, confusions in meaning, problems of foreign accent and intonation, regionalisms, etc., that could have been discussed, if the purpose was to impress the audience with the importance of speech as an academic discipline. A more important reason for this meeting would be to give the parents important information regarding the availability of services: where to call, who to talk to, what will happen, how long will it go on, what their responsibilities are, etc. These seemed to be the crucial issues that brought the parents to the meeting and virtually went unanswered.

The two speakers could not be heard beyond the first few rows. There was no amplification system and they did not possess the vocal equipment to speak in a large auditorium unaided.

The room was very poorly ventilated. It was a warm evening and the room had no windows.

No interpretation was given to the parents as to why this kind of program in speech is important for their children. There was no motivation to gain the parents' support.

Materials should have been distributed and not just left for the parents to help themselves. The stampede that followed brought on the collapse of the meeting before other matters were completed.

Summary

The teachers were charming young ladies with voices hardly above a whisper. The content of their talks might have been appropriate to a sophisticated PTA group but not to this audience.

The other two meetings monitored were reported in more positive terms. The contents of the talks in both were considered interesting and meaningful to the parents. The one ad hoc demonstration lesson, with children who were present at the meeting, was evaluated negatively. It was considered too superficial and too long. However, the parents seemed to enjoy both sessions and the sessions seemed to help parent-school communication. Suggestions made for improvement are:

1. Providing a Spanish-English interpreter.
2. Starting sessions at 8 p.m. instead of 7 p.m.
3. Inviting classroom teachers to attend.
4. Improving advance publicity.
5. Translating materials into the languages of the non-English speaking parents.
6. Planning follow-up sessions with parents.

May - June series: Three sessions in one series and two in the other, parallel series were monitored, covering about three-fifths of the contents of this program.

Evaluations of the lectures on creative dramatics ranged from 2 (rather poor) in relation to specific application to problems and needs of disadvantaged children, to 4 and 5 (good to excellent) in relation to teaching innovations and implementing general objectives for speech improvement. The teacher was judged to be excellent, the session stimulating, but too much of the time given to kinescopes and not enough given that was of specific relevance to the problems dealt with by the audience.

In one group, many participants were amused but not very involved. This observation raises the question of screening for most effective choice of participants.

The lecture on problem sounds of English was evaluated in the 1 to 2 range (not at all useful to somewhat useful) by one consultant and in the 2 to 3 range by a second consultant. The following comments explain the ratings: This session was a rambling, superficial, confused, incorrect presentation of English sounds, stress, intonation, and structure. There was only muddled content. Obviously, from the notes and the questions and comments, the implied objectives were not realized. The materials used for the most part were out of date, and the group could have stayed at home and read the bulletin. There was no motivation, culmination, evaluation, summary or reinforcement. It was almost entirely a straight, very superficial, non-stop lecture. The participation was poor. The understanding very questionable, and the interest obviously lacking. The group was noisy, rude to each other and to the lecturer, and several left before the end of the session.

With all of the teachers present being from Hebrew parochial schools, much more attention should have been given to the two specific problems that teachers in the audience did mention, but the follow up was thin. These problems are: the ng-g confusion and the rising intonation in declarative statements. Likewise, the lecturer seemed to rely too much upon the Board of Education publication "Toward Better Speech" to provide examples of what to do with the children. Thus, she was skimpy in providing examples of drills, games, activities and procedures for group or individual work that the teacher can conduct with her children. The background information as to sounds of English and sentence patterns was not sufficiently organized in its presentation to be of maximum value to the teachers.

Overcrowding, lack of a blackboard and insufficiency of materials to be distributed added to the problems of this session. Recommendations for improvement include use of tape recordings of the sounds discussed, a demonstration of corrective procedures, and more attention to the motivations necessary to get children from the disadvantaged milier to become concerned about correct speech: the issues of group acceptance of the social and personal forces working *against* the children's wanting to change their patterns. Pre-session information about what speech patterns the teachers wanted help with could have made *this* a more useful presentation.

Two equivalent sessions on oral reporting and group discussion were monitored. One presentation was rated 3 (moderately useful) by one consultant and about 2 (somewhat useful) by another. The presentation was considered "pedantic and rambling, with insufficient explanation of new terms and too few examples of application." The announced topic of group discussion was not covered.

No attempt was made to relate these speech activities to the needs of disadvantaged or parochial school children. The relationship between critical listening and public speaking and discussion was never touched on. The values of discussion in a democracy, of freedom to disagree, of citizens' responsibilities in making joint decisions were never even mentioned. No relationships were established between giving oral reports and the development of language. Insufficient time was devoted to ways in which vocabulary and grammer improves through oral communication.

Insufficient emphasis was placed on the psychological elements of ego development, self realization, control of others through speech, peaceful solutions vs. physical conflicts, personality development, etc.

Mimeographed materials should include examples that are appropriate to the disadvantaged and non-public school child.

Summary

The parallel session on the same topic, by a different speaker, received ratings of 4 or 5 in most areas, despite the judgement that the topic was much too broad for the time allotted, and was not completely covered by the speaker. Organizational matters such as getting the attendance and distributing materials without interfering with the lecture needed attention. Information about the exact location of the session was also not easily available. The audience, however, was attentive; the speaker related to specific needs of disadvantaged children, and took cognizance of special situations facing the Yeshivah students with whom these teachers dealt.

Of the four speakers evaluated, two were judged to be relatively poor and two as good to excellent. In terms of audience experience, the group for which three sessions were monitored were exposed to one low-rated meeting and two relatively good ones. The parallel group had one poor meeting and one relatively good one (no others were monitored). On balance within the limits of our observations, more meetings were good than poor. Outstanding in all, however, was the lack of specific linkage with the special problems of teachers who deal both with disadvantaged children and the special conditions of parochial schools. Too many of the presentations seemed too general in reference and too superficial in coverage to be as effective in its use of time as a more specifically designed program would be. The mimeographed materials were also clearly not specifically designed for this audience.

All who are aware of the handicaps of time pressures, inadequate logistical support under which the Spring speech programs were launched agree that they were a superb achievement. Unevenness of quality, occasional inadequacy of physical arrangements, less than optimal relevance to the needs of the participants can be remedied with more time to plan, more adequate clerical help and supplies, better pre-planning and in-session communication with the participants. The growing interest in speech improvement evinced by the classroom teachers indicates that this program has been of a high professional quality and relatively successful.

July Series: Of the ten speakers monitored, only 3 were given averaged ratings below 4: two were rated at the 3 or moderately useful level, and one was rated 2 (somewhat useful). With seven speakers rated good to excellent, the lecture program could be considered superior, on balance.

At least three of the speakers read their remarks. This detracted from their impact. Those who spoke directly to the audience were better received.

Of five demonstrations witnessed, two almost duplicated each other. Only one used children as subjects. The use of adults who were supposed to pretend to be children attenuated the impact of the demonstrations, which the teachers had been asking for through two sets of previous programs.

Despite the shortcomings, most demonstrations were considered good.

The major criticisms were the following:

1. There is still evidence of lack of adequate internal communication in the supervisory staff. At the sixth session, the demonstrator did not know what the subject of the lecture was to be nor did she know that the content of the previous day's demonstration, which she duplicated.

2. Demonstrations were not coordinated with the lectures they accompanied in all cases. Some lecturers would have been more effective as demonstrators than the other person used.

3. Although more effort was made to consider the needs of the bilingual child and the child with substandard speech, most of the emphasis appeared to be on the Negro child. Over half the audience do not deal with Negro children, but they do deal with a vast array of speech patterns that need correction to become standard English. One speaker briefly mentioned principal characteristics of speech in Spanish, French, and Yiddish; two additional speakers dwelt almost entirely on speech problems of the disadvantaged Negro child.

4. In projecting a profile of the disadvantaged child, speakers dwelt almost exclusively on experiential elements that are peculiar to the disadvantaged Negro child. Again, this did not meet the needs of over half the audience.

5. Linguistics considered an extremely important approach to understanding of speech problems and was judged to have been covered very superficially and in some instances incorrectly.

6. Method of teaching English as a second language, referred to several times as "useful," were not elaborated by any speaker in any useful way.

7. The use of adults in demonstrations which should be given with children as subjects minimized their impact.

The major values, as perceived by our consultants, were:

1. An attempt to relate specifically to some of the problems of some of the disadvantaged.

2. Presentation in most lectures of concrete kinds of information that teachers can apply in classroom situations.

3. Presentation in demonstrations of practical procedures teachers can adapt to their own classes.

4. The high professional caliber of most of the presentors.

Evaluation by Participants

Ratings: Ratings on 11 items were tabulated from 160 questionnaires returned, with responses, by teachers who had attended either the one-day institute or the 5-6 sessions series in May and June. These represented 38 percent of the total attendance.

Ratings on the same items were separately tabulated from 57 questionnaires returned by teachers who attended the July series. These represented 51 percent of the total attendance (as reported by the Coordinator of the program).

The ratings for the Spring and the Summer programs are presented below, in percentages of responses given in each category. Numbers in parenthesis following headings refer to the questionnaire items from which each was derived.

1. Facilities for participation by teachers: (1a)

	May-June	July
Good to excellent	36%	51%
Moderately adequate	48%	41%
Inadequate	11%	4%
No response	5%	5%

2. Physical arrangements of workshops: (2)

	May-June	July
Good to excellent	46%	41%
Moderately satisfactory	42%	51%
Inadequate	8%	6%
No response	1%	2%

3. Clarity of presentations: (5)

	May-June	July
Very clear	73%	78%
Moderately clear	25%	21%
Not clear	1%	0%
No response	2%	0%

4. Appropriateness of content: (11)

	May-June	July
Almost all appropriate	58%	61%
About half appropriate	29%	27%
Very little appropriate	5%	2%
No response	8%	2%

5. Allowance for individual differences: (12)

	May-June	July
All variations allowed for	39%	48%
Moderate amount of flexibility	43%	37%
No flexibility	5%	0%
No response	11%	16%

6. Harmony of workshop objectives with school objectives: (16)

	May-June	July
Almost completely the same	58%	65%
Some disagreement	28%	30%
No agreement	4%	0%
No response	9%	5%

7. Addition to teacher's skills: (19)

One-day only		May-June	July
15%	A great deal added	30%	49%
35%	Moderate addition	48%	44%
17%	Very little added	11%	0%
29%	No response	10%	7%

8. Proportion of content applicable in teacher's school situation: (21)

	May-June	July
All or almost all	43%	53%
About half	43%	43%
Very little	6%	0%
No response	7%	5%

9. Degree of implementation of teacher's needs (22)

One day only		May-June	July
12%	Completely implemented	24%	40%
38%	Moderately implemented	57%	48%
9%	Very little implemented	6%	0%
41%	No response	13%	12%

10. Specific relationship of content to needs of the disadvantaged child: (31)

One day only		May-June	July
31%	Completely & specifically related	44%	58%
38%	Moderately related--as much related to needs of all children	43%	37%
9%	Not related	4%	2%
22%	No response	8%	4%

11. General evaluation of workshop sessions in this subject: (34)

One day only		May-June	July
50%	Good to excellent	71%	90%
17%	Moderately good	19%	9%
3%	Of little or no value	4%	0%
29%	No response	6%	2%

From internal evidence, it was possible to select 58 questionnaires of persons who had attended the one-day institutes only. Ratings from these were tabulated for items 7, 9, 10, 11 above and the results are presented to the left the step-value designation. As might have been expected, these indicate a lower evaluation of the program, with a much larger proportion of respondents refusing to give a rating. Commingling the ratings from the one-day and the 5-6 meeting series participants probably lowered the May-June evaluations somewhat. However, these made up less than one-third of the questionnaires tabulated for May-June, and could not have exerted a decisive effect. (The selective ratings reported separately included those from many papers that came too late to be included in the major tabulation.)

A comparison of ratings for the three programs indicates a more positive assessment on most items with each succeeding segment of the program. According to our records, only 16 persons in the summer session were involved in multiple segments of the program. The difference in evaluation represents, therefore, responses mainly of different individuals, andcan be interpreted to indicate differential impacts of the respective programs. Each succeeding program seems to be coming closer to filling teacher needs.

Responses to Open-ended Items

Responses reported here came mainly from 38 questionnaires, selected to represent all grades, religions and geographic locations represented by those who attended the 5-6 session series in the Spring. These questionnaires were exhaustively analyzed. Fifty-eight questionnaires from the July series were selectively analyzed, mainly for responses that indicated still unfulfilled needs. Fifty-eight questionnaires from teachers who attended only the one-day session were also scanned for special responses.

One-Day Institutes

Opinions on these varied, depending largely on which institute the respondent had attended. It should be remembered that these were all offered on Saturdays; the Yeshivah teachers were, therefore, absent. The criticisms could be largely covered by the following remarks:

1. The presentations could not be heard in one meeting, where the microphone failed.

2. The needs of the Spanish-speaking children seemed to be neglected--emphasis was largely on the Negro.

3. One demonstration did not fill its objective because the teacher seemed to have poor rapport with the children and the exercise selected was too difficult for them; another seemed too "childish" for the grade it was supposed to suit.

4. The demonstrations did not meet the needs of teachers of very young and of older children.

5. In one meeting the child participants could not be clearly observed because of their seating relative to the audience.

6. Some found the talks boring and repetitious.

7. Some found the content superficial, and the speakers poor exponents of good speech practices.

8. Communication was inadequate, notices were sent late, allowing no time to change prior commitments.

9. For some, the lectures were not clear. Some lecturers tried to cover too much in too short a time.

10. Some said they could use nothing presented at the sessions; others, that nothing new was presented.

The remarks reported above reflect the experience of one segment of the teachers. Another segment reported very positively on their exposure to the meetings. One, a speech therapist, said, "All presentations were well prepared and handled quite expertly. ....consistently interesting......" Other testimonials declared, "This was the best workshop I ever attended." "Workshop far exceeded my expectations."

The most frequent suggestions for improvement mentioned the need for more practical procedures the teachers could apply, smaller groups, more chance for discussion, more demonstrations with ordinary classroom groups, more sessions with broader coverage. The figure of 50 percent, gleaned from the ratings, who found the presentations good to excellent seems about right.

May-June Series

Qualifications and motivations of participants: Judging from the questionnaires analyzed, most teachers attended from personal interest in the program. About 15 percent said they were directed to come. About 20 percent whose questionnaires were analyzed had had extensive training in speech. About 12 percent said they had had no previous training. The rest had had one or more undergraduate courses in college.

Physical Conditions of Workshops

Teachers who attended the evening sessions commented on crowded conditions and occasional inability to hear because of the private conversations of other participants. (The offenders seemed to be male teachers of religion or a foreign language, whose subsidized presence in this program might raise questions of appropriate screening procedures.) Heat, lack of a blackboard, uncomfortable seats were also mentioned.

Opportunity for Participation: For the most part, these sessions were lectures and offered little opportunity to participate. Only the session on creative dramatics included audience participation. Teachers expressed resentment at calling the sessions "workshops" when they were, in fact, lectures. They complained two hours was too long to listen without a break and requested more opportunity to participate actively.

Changes and additions desired:

1. Teachers would like a pre-course agenda, with indications of approximate class levels of application, sent to them before meetings are to take place. Teachers of primary grades, for example, found the session on Parliamentary Procedures irrelevant to their needs.

2. Less time spent in theoretical lectures, more demonstration lessons are wanted.

3. More specific information on how to detect defects early is needed.

4. Specific training in use of corrective techniques under guidance is wanted; this refers particularly to correcting foreign and substandard speech patterns.

5. More material suitable for junior high and high school levels should be included, or else teachers of these levels should be screened out.

6. Specific training in teaching English as a second language is wanted.

7. Demonstrations with disadvantaged children in full size classes, focusing on correct speech sounds, would be very welcome--on several class levels.

8. More consideration for speech problems of other than American Negro and Spanish speaking children was frequently requested. A large number of these teachers have to deal with inadequate speech patterns generated by foreign-language influences. Mentioned were Israeli, French (Haitian), West Indian, Italian, Greek, Oriental, Yiddish and the "Brooklyn" accent.

9. Teachers would like help with their own speech so that they can serve as better models for the children.

10. More sessions on dramatics, choral speaking, and pantomine are wanted.

11. Future speakers should talk directly to and with participants, not "at" them--and lectures should not be read.

12. Lectures should be less repetitious.

13. Enough materials should be supplied so that all might receive them.

14. More lesson plans would be welcome.

15. Smaller classes, with more provision for discussion, would be preferred.

16. A Brooklyn location for the sessions for Yeshivah teachers seems logical, since about 80 percent live in Brooklyn.

17. Better communication about the program is needed: more informative, earlier, and directed to lay as well as religious teachers.

More Useful Items: Responses in this area varied according to the grades being taught. Parliamentary procedures and oral reporting were valued by teachers of junior high school classes but considered irrelevant by primary grade teachers. Most seemed to feel they could use creative dramatics, choral speaking, proper use of voice, as much as they could get on the sounds of English and listening skills.

Special Utility for Disadvantaged Children

More than half the participants saw this program as only moderately related to the needs of the disadvantaged. Many perceived it as applying to all children, not specifically the disadvantaged; others said it applied only to a limited segment of the culturally disadvantaged, and that was not the segment they taught. Some were puzzled at their inclusion in the program, since they did not consider their pupils "disadvantaged."

Relevance to Situation of Parochial Schools

As usual, teachers felt many techniques displayed and discussed could not be used in classes of 40 and 50 children. Only 4 reported the availability of a speech therapist. Many questioned their ability to segregate enough time for special speech exercises. Most, however, believed they would be able to apply some of what they had learned--and they were clearly alerted to the importance of good speech, in themselves as well as their pupils.

Perhaps the best indicator of the teachers' evaluation of the program is their willingness to continue to participate. Of 32 who responded to the question, 69 percent said they would continue, even without renumeration; 28 percent would not unless renumerated. In both groups, qualifications were made: that more of real utility in the higher grades be included and that the program be improved.

July series: Largely because of time pressures on the completion of this report, the questionnaires returned by the July participants were scanned mainly for suggestions for improvement. The level of their general assessment is indicated in the ratings reported above. We look to their open-ended responses for reasons for less-than-optimal ratings.

Many of the requests echo those made after the May-June series, but they were indicated in more specific terms and a more spirited manner. These are the general tenor of the remarks:

1. No more reading of papers at the audience, *please*; also no two-hour lecture sessions.

2. Less theory, less repetition or undergraduate college level information.

3. More time given to practical corrective techniques, related to helping children speak acceptable English and improving voice production.

4. More help with accents other than American Negro and Puerto Rican--less than half the summer session enrollees deal with these. They need help with Eastern and Middle European, Israeli, Italian, Greek, Polish, Haitian, Irish, German influences on speech.

5. More realistic demonstrations, with large classes and a *variety* of *disadvantaged* children.

6. Better age-grade balance-more on the very young and the older children-through high school.

7. More practical lesson plans and directions for corrective procedures.

8. Smaller groups and more time for discussion.

9. Improved communication about programs--earlier notices, pre-session information from teachers about desired content, more informative notices.

10. More specialized programs, with different emphasis, permitting a choice of emphasis.

11. Grouping of teachers according to age-grade needs and specific speech problems current in the specific schools.

12. More realistic consideration of what can be done in short periods of time and with large classes.

13. Analysis of the teacher's speech problem and help in overcoming them seems a basic necessity for an effective program.

Despite the list of improvements wanted, 9.0 percent of respondents gave the program a "good-to-excellent" rating. The fact that almost half reported their needs only moderately implemented suggests strongly that the planning personnel needs to open dialogue directly with the teachers to discover how best to serve them. With a variety of qualifications, mainly referring to future implementation of their needs, 76 percent of the respondents indicated willingness to continue to participate in future programs, even without renumeration. An additional 19 percent would come if paid.

Recommendations: The teachers' suggestions would seem to offer a practical and valid guide to the future. More specialized programs, utilizing homogeneous grouping of teachers (by needs and interests) seem to be indicated. Pre-planning two-way communication with the teachers themselves is essential for more effective impact. Better intra-organization communication is obviously needed. About 500 teachers have been alerted to the need for and the possibility of speech improvement for children. A more intensive, concrete and practical follow-up to the 1965-66 orientation programs seems the only logical next step.

General Recommendations

Specific recommendations for subject-matter programs can be found, either explicitly stated or implied in the participants' suggestions detailed in the course of each evaluation. Here we intend to speak briefly only about matters which are implicated in all the programs discussed in this report.

It is understandable that under the pressure of the short notice under which the programs had to be implemented there was not time for adequate communication channels to be established nor for specially designed materials to be evolved. It is generally argued that to have launched the programs on the level they reached was a praiseworthy achievement.

If they are to continue, however, the plea of lack of time for adequate organization and communication will no longer be valid. Good as they were, several glaring shortcomings afflicted all the programs.

The most obvious was a lack or a breakdown in both intra-organizational and inter-organizational communication. Within the programs, in several instances persons presenting the materials had not seen a copy of the project description and did not know what project objectives they were supposed to fulfill. They had no information about the prior training of the participants, the latter's needs or expectations, the conditions in which their teaching was to be applied. One presentor in the program seemed not to know what his predecessor had presented nor what was to come after him. This lack of coordination was obvious in the music and in the speech programs particularly.

No arrangements were made for systematic inquiry into the specific needs of the teachers in the subject-matter areas. No information was collected concerning the teacher's level of expertise. Both these kinds of information would seem to be minimal essentials for an effective program in any field, as would information about the grade level balance to be expected in the prospective audiences.

No attempts at systematic interim evaluations seem to have been made. A brief questionnaire distributed once, at or near the end of a series of presentations, does not qualify as interim evaluation. Some means of ascertaining what was not understood, what was applicable and what seemed not to be, what needed expansion should be devised for use at the end of each presentation, coupled with continuous feedback concerning the success or failure of the use of suggested procedures in real classroom situations.

Communication about the program was inadequate in many instances. There should be adequate time between the announcement of a program and its first session to permit teachers to dispose of previous commitments and to make other necessary arrangements to permit them to attend. Many teachers requested that announcements about all the training programs be coordinated, so that they may have a real opportunity to select which they wish to attend. This seems an eminently reasonable and feasible procedure.

Many of the schools have apparently been negligent in bringing information about the programs to the attention of all their teachers. Many teachers in parochial schools have often not been notified. Schools which have separate religious and secular departments should have notices sent to both. Schools which have separate programs for boys and for girls need more than one notice. Administrators of parochial schools should be advised of their duty to inform their lay teachers of these programs. Perhaps this can be instituted through discussion with the coordinators and liaison persons from the parochial systems.

Communication with the Director of Evaluation has been wholly inadequate. Additional sessions were planned and given without notifying her. Records have been hopelessly muddled. No logs or summaries of the contents of early sessions were available, despite a specific statement that they would be kept, by both the presentors and the teachers, in the project description. It has been extremely difficult to obtain attendance data, and in the case of some programs, this was never made completely available. Special difficulties in this area were encountered in relation to the speech program, which was highly complex. All programs, however, seemed equally disorganized in this respect. In future programs, recordkeeping should be planned and freely shared with the responsible evaluation personnel. The fact that evaluation is an integral part of the project, should be understood by all the program coordinators from the beginning and procedures for filling the needs of the evaluation process should be preplanned in collaboration with senior evaluation personnel.

Recordkeeping at the Board of Education must be improved. It has been impossible, for example, to obtain a convenient, complete, accurate master list of schools which are eligible to be included in the teacher-training program. Comparison of three lists supposedly indicating all the schools eligible for three different subject-matters after-school programs revealed discrepancies among them. Since eligibility had been supposed to be determined by a master formula based on concentration of disadvantaged populations in the school areas, it is difficult to see how discrepancies can validly occur when lists are made up for different subject matter fields. Finally, although the largest number of schools listed was 156, in one of the programs, representatives from 157 schools appeared on the attendance sheets.

Screening of participants is another matter for consideration. Many individuals whose classroom assignments have no perceptible connection with the training being given have registered for these programs and collected the subsidies offered. Others who do not need the training because they are themselves highly trained professionals in the fields have done likewise. Are these occurences entirely within the intent of the grant?

With reference to the content of the programs, the most essential modifications relate to the special needs of the disadvantaged and the capabilities of the parochial schools. Neither of these seem to have been given much thought. New methods and new materials must be devised to help teachers cope with both these challenges.

And active cognizance must be given to the fact that this program relates to many different kinds of disadvantaged children and the balance among them differs from the balance found in the public school population. Recognition of differences in sub-group cultures and in the common characteristics of individuals developing within different cultural milieux is essential if a valid foundation for dealing with all equally effectively is to be given. To do less than this would seem to pervert the intent of those who have given the stamp of their approval to this project by supporting it.

PROJECT STAFF

Research Director

Dr. Ruth E. Hartley, Research Consultant, Research Foundation, The City University of New York

Research Staff

Mrs. Mary R. Delcuve, Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Education, Long Island University
Mr. Joseph DiGennaro, Instructor, Hunter College - Doctoral Candidate, T.C., Columbia U.
Mrs. Mary Hellman, Coordinator, Reference Services, Montclair State College, Montclair, New Jersey
Mr. Merrill S. Lifton, Lecturer, Division of Teacher Education, The City University, New York, New York
Mrs. Eleanor B. Morrison, Instructor and Coordinator, School Speech and Hearing Programs, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Dr. Loretta Wagner Smith, Chairman, Dept. of Speech and Theater, Coordinator of Speech Education, Brooklyn College
Mr. Michael Esselstrom, Doctoral Candidate, Dept. of Music Education, Teachers College, Columbia University
Mr. John V. Gilbert, Doctoral Candidate in Music, Teachers College, Columbia University
Mr. Scott Greer, Instructor in Dept. of Physical Education, Hunter College
Mr. Stewart Kranz, Fellow and Doctoral Candidate in Fine Arts, Teachers College, Columbia University
Mr. George T. Merritt, Doctoral Candidate in Music, Teachers College, Columbia University
Mr. James O. Mintz, Doctoral Candidate in Music, Teachers College, Columbia University
Mr. Edward J.P. O'Connor, Instructor, Dept. of Music and Music Education, Teachers College, Columbia University
Mr. Jack Schiltz, Instructor in Physical Education, Dalton School; Doctoral Candidate in Physical Education
Mr. George E. Pitluga, Doctoral Candidate in Fine Arts and Fine Arts Education, Teachers College, Columbia University
Dr. Harold M. Scholl, Professor of Speech, Montclair State College, Montclair, New Jersey
Mr. Alvin Smith, Doctoral Candidate, Teachers College, Columbia University
Mr. Bruce H. White, Doctoral Candidate, Dept. of Fine Arts, Teachers College, Columbia University

UD 002461

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, N. Y. C.

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

FORM I

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF EACH SESSION MONITORED

I. Give a full running description of what took place with content to be stated in terms of objectives in three general areas: Skills, Literature, Concepts.

Include assessment of physical conditions, materials, methods, and activities, considering the following items:

A. Teacher Methods
  1. provides varied experiences for the group and individuals
  2. lecture
  3. discussion
  4. problem solving
  5. imaginative use of facilities and materials
  6. encourages outside exploration
  7. student-initiated activities
  8. creative approach to content and materials
  9. Pace flexible to student interests and needs
  10. Logical sequence

B. Audience Activities
  1. Listening
  2. Participating
  3. Creating
  4. Reading

II. Describe the apparent objectives of the session, with consideration for the following:

A. General Objectives of the Program
B. Instructional Objectives (These will be grouped into the three specific areas of learning: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.)

Criteria for evaluating the objectives:

1. Have any instructional objectives been stated?
2. How were these objectives formulated --- administration, teacher, or students-teacher?
3. Are the objectives stated in terms of overt behavior?
4. Are all levels of learning included?
5. Are they consistent with the broad objectives of the program?
6. Are they realistic enough to be achieved?
7. Does the teacher utilize these objectives in his own evaluation?'

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF EACH SESSION MONITORED
(continued)

XI. Ratings of Teacher Training Sessions

1. To what extent did the session you observed implement each of the objectives as stated in the project description in relation to teacher training? Rate it in relation to each objective separately, in the following terms:

   1. not at all
   2. somewhat
   3. moderately
   4. well
   5. very well

(See project description for specific area objectives. Use the above 5-point scale to answer all questions)

2. To what extent did the content of the session seem to contribute to solving classroom problems?

3. To what extent did the session seem to help meet the interests of disadvantaged children?

4. To what extent did the session deal with the "far-reaching problems" of disadvantaged children?

5. To what extent did the session contribute "innovations in content" and "additional teaching skills"?

Please attach this brief rating to each session report. Each observer is requested to submit a rating for each session observed, each rating to be independently made, without discussion among the observers present at any specific session.

FORM I

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF EACH SESSION MONITORED
(continued)

III. Estimate audience reaction in terms of

a) interest

b) comprehension

IV. Estimate the level of the lecturer's or demonstrator's quality

V. Estimate the degree of success in achieving objectives

VI. Estimate the usefulness of content to teachers

VII. What was especially valuable in the session for teachers of disadvantaged children?

VIII. What was especially valuable for non-public school teachers?

IX. What was especially valuable for teachers in elementary schools?

X. Give suggestions concerning omissions or improvements that might have been made.

Form 2

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Evaluation Questionnaire
TEACHER TRAINING AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM
Non-Public Schools, Title I

Dear Teacher-Participant: We ask your cooperation in evaluating the training-demonstration program in which you participated, with a view to improving future programs. Our ability to devise improvement depends largely on you. Therefore would you please answer the questions put to you here fully, explicitly and candidly? We thank you most sincerely for your help.

1. Please answer the following questions with reference to the workshops, lectures on institutes you attended on the subject matter underlined:
    1. Art
    2. Music
    3. Health Education
    4. Speech
    5. Library Services

2. Where opinions are solicited, please be frank. Individuals will not be identified in the report.

3. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope by July 25.

Mr. Joseph Krevisky, Research Coordinator
Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I,
Non-Public School Personnel

Teacher Name ______________________

School Name ______________________

School Address ______________________ Telephone __________

Home Address ______________________ Telephone __________

Grade Level Taught ______________________

List all the workshops you have been attending under ESEA, Title I, Non-Public Schools:

I.

a. What are your primary teaching responsibilities?

b. What additional teaching or other responsibilities do you carry?

c. Describe your professional preparation in the subject matter area underlined on page 1.

d. Why did you choose to attend this training program?
(If you did not come by choice, but were directed to come, please say so.)

II. Teacher Training Workshops, Lectures and Demonstrations

1. To what extent were facilities provided for you to participate actively in the training sessions?

1a. Were these facilities adequate? Please check the line below to indicate your opinion.

very inadequate		moderately satisfactory		perfect

2. Were you able to see and hear the proceedings satisfactorily? If not, please explain.

Please indicate your opinion of the physical arrangements by checking the line below:

very inadequate		moderately satisfactory		perfect

3. To what extent were you given individual guidance or instruction in:
   (1) Use of materials or following procedures recommended during the sessions

   (2) Procedures for introducing the activity to your class.

4. Did you have enough time to participate actively during the sessions? Were you afforded ample opportunity to apply what you learned then and there? Have you any suggestions about this?

5. How well were you able to understand the content of the workshops? If you could not understand some parts, what were the reasons? The level of presentation? Organization of the material? Your previous training?

Now, please show by checking the line below, how clear the presentations were:

extremely difficult to understand		moderately clear		perfectly clear in all particulars

6. Were the sessions you attended clearly related to each other or was each one separate and discrete? Did one lead into another or take off from a preceding one? Did they enhance and support each other? Explain.

7. What changes in organization and presentation of the training sessions would you recommend?

8. Did the persons presenting the workshops, etc. reveal a thorough grasp of the topics presented? Did this vary from session to session? Please be specific.

9. Were the workshops, etc. thorough or superficial in their coverages of topics? Explain.

10. Were the sessions consistently interesting or sometimes boring? Explain.

11. How appropriate was the content of the workshops, etc. for your use? Please tell us specifically what was useful and what was not, and why.

Now, please indicate your opinion by one check mark on the line.

not at all appropriate		about half was appropriate		perfect - could use all

12. To what extent did the activities presented allow for the expression of individual interests and varying ability among your pupils?

Now, please indicate your opinion by checking the appropriate place on the line below:

no individuality allowed for	moderate range and flexibility	all levels and interests include

13. What were the purposes of these workshops as you understood them?

14. How were the purposes of the workshops communicated to you?

15. In what ways were the purposes of the workshops consistent with those of your school?

16. In what ways were the purposes of the workshops inconsistent with those of your school?

Please show the extent of harmony in objectives for this subject area between your school and the program by checking the line below:

not at all in harmony	some harmony, some disagreement	completely in harmony

17. How were you able to indicate, in advance, what topics or problems you wanted discussed at each workshop?

(a) How satisfactory was this procedure?

(b) What other procedure would you recommend?

18. How were you able to indicate, after each workshop, what you had learned that was of value to you or what needed expansion?

(a) How satisfactory was this procedure?

(b) What other procedure would you recommend?

19. What have the training sessions added to your skills? Be specific.

Please check the line below to indicate your opinion:

has added nothing to my skills

has improved my skills moderately

has improved my skills enormously

20. How are these skills important in your teaching situation?

21. What opportunities do you anticipate for applying what you have learned? What changes in your teaching will occur because of these sessions?

Please summarize your situation by checking the appropriate place on the line below:

will be able to apply nothing		will be able to apply about half		will be able to apply everything

22. In general how well were your needs in this subject area implemented? How did the presentations fall short of your needs? (Please be specific.)

Now, please indicate by checking the line below, your opinion on this question.

did not fill needs at all		filled needs moderately		filled needs perfectly and completely

23. Comment on the following areas that might limit your use of what you have learned.

A. The administration or facilities of your school

B. Your background

C. Pupils.

D. Grade level you teach

E. Parents or community

F. Other

24. What subjects or activities included in the workshops would you have liked more of?

25. What information or demonstrations were most useful in your school situation? Explain.

26. What would you want included in the workshops that was omitted?

27. With regard to the workshops that you attended, what improvements would you recommend in:

    a. Physical facilities

    b. Materials:
        (1) Content

        (2) Sufficiency

        (3) Suitability

    c. Location

    d. Time of Day

    e. Any other feature

28. Was communication about the availability of the program adequate and effective? If not, please describe the difficulty.

29. In what way did this training program contribute specifically to the needs of the disadvantaged children in your area?

30. How could this contribution be improved?

31. How much of this program, if any, seemed unrelated to the needs of the disadvantaged children in your area? (Please be frank and give specific examples)

Here, please indicate the degree of relatedness shown by the program as a whole to the needs of disadvantaged children specifically by checking the line below:

not at all related		only moderately related - as much related to all children		specifically and completely related to the disadvantaged

32. Would you participate in a similar training program in a different or advanced area if offered again?

A. Yes, whether or not remuneration was offered. Explain.

B . Only if remuneration was offered. Explain.

C. No. I would not like to participate in any more training programs of this kind. Explain.

33. What comments, suggestions or observations do you wish to make that you have not already made?

34. Please place a check along the following scale to indicate your evaluation of the workshop sessions in this subject matter area, as a whole:

No value	Some	Moderate	Good	Excellent

Speech

The following question is for those who are answering this questionnaire about the Speech Workshops only.

SP 1. What teacher in your school is qualified to conduct or supervise a program in:

a. Speech Improvement ______________________________

b. Speech Therapy ______________________________

c. What are the teacher's qualifications?

Music

The following questions are for those answering this questionnaire about Music Workshops only.

M 1. What special considerations should guide one in choosing musical materials for your school?

M 2. If you were to attend future teacher training workshops, which of the following topics would you choose first, second, etc. Mark 1,2,3, etc.

____Song flute program
____Music reading for classroom vocal music
____Music appreciation (Classics)
____String instruments (Learning to play and teach)
____Band instruments (Learning to play and teach)
____Group singing in assemblies
____Choral directing
____Constructing rhythm instruments
____Singing and playing of folk music
____Musical composition (Classics)
____Other

Health Education

The following questions are for those answering this questionnaire about the Health Education Training Program only.

H.E.1 To what degree and in what way did the workshop sessions contribute to your knowledge and teaching competency of the following physical education and health education activities: (Be specific!)

a. Dance

Now, please check the place in the line that is appropriate for you:

not at all moderate contribution extremely good

b. Exercise

Now, please check the appropriate point on the line:

not at all moderate contribution extremely useful

c. Games with and without equipment (Be specific)

Now please check on both lines below your position:

Games without equipment

not useful moderate contribution extremely useful

Games with equipment

not useful moderate contribution extremely useful

d. Use of health guidance tools and instruments (eg. eye charts, audiometer, stadiometer, various health record forms) Please mention specific tools and forms.

Now, check on the line below how you would assess this part:

not useful moderate contribution extremely useful

H.E.2. To what degree and in what way was the demonstration of the proper use of the following materials of use to you in your school situation? (Please give specific examples)

a. Physical education supplies (balls, bats, goggles, traffic cones) (Please give specific examples)

Please check the place on the line that expresses your opinion:

not at all useful moderately useful extremely useful

b. Physical education equipment (Mats, horizontal bar, parallel bars)

Please check the place on the line that expresses your opinion:

not at all useful moderately useful extremely useful

c. Health guidance tools (eye charts, audiometer, various health record forms)

Please check the place on the line that expresses your opinion:

not at all useful moderately useful extremely useful

H.E.3. From the skills and knowledge attained at the health education workshop, what specific health education and physical education activities in the following areas do you feel you can conduct in the future of your school:

a. Dance

b. Exercise

c. Games

d. Health guidance activities

H.E.4. To what extent did the content of the workshop in health education and physical education contribute to alleviating pupil problems or needs? Be specific.

not at all   moderate contribution   extremely helpful

Form 3

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Divisio
Title I Evaluations

WORKSHOP PERSONNEL INVENTORY

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION OBSERVATION SHEET

Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title I Health Education.

Teacher Training Session for Non-Public School Personnel
New York City School of Art and Design, 4-7 p.m., May 27, 1966.

TEACHER NAME ______________________________

SCHOOL NAME ______________________________ TELEPHONE __________

TEACHER'S HOME ADDRESS ______________________ TELEPHONE __________

1. What grade level do you normally teach? ______________________________
2. Are you a regular or substitute teacher? ______________________________
3. How many other teacher training sessions have you attended? ______________
4. What were the dates of these sessions? ______________________________
5. How much, if any, training have you had in health education?

none______________

some______________

advanced training (please list)

____

____

____

Form 4

WORKSHOP PERSONNEL INVENTORY

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION EVALUATION SHEET

Elementary and Secondary Education Act-Title I Music

Teacher Training Session for Non-Public School Personnel

1. What grade level do you normally teach? ________________
2. Do you usually teach music in your classroom? ____________
3. What music equipment do you have available in the classroom?

4. Do you have the services of a music supervisor or specialist?
5. Do you feel that the music program is adequately supported?
   Do you feel that the music program is adequately funded?
6. Within your school how many hours are devoted to music?
7. Within your school are music services offered after school?
8. Within your school is there an organized music program?
   K-3 ____________________ 4-6 ____________ Other ________
9. Do you feel comfortable teaching music in the classroom? (please explain)

10. Is there a particular area of music that you would like to know more about?

11. Do you participate in any sort of music activity outside of your school?

12. How much training have you had in music education?
    None ____________ Some ________ Advanced training (list) __________

13. In terms of children's music, which of the following music program objectives do you consider most needed?
    A. Promotion of children's appreciation of music ________________
    B. Development of children's aural perception ________________
    C. Development of children's musical skills ________________
    D. Promotion of understanding and knowledge of music ____________
    E. Other

14. Do you have any comments?

Form 4A

Workshop Personnel Inventory
(Continued)

Name ______________________________ School ______________________

Home Address ________________________ Number of Meetings Attended ________

1. How many children are in your class? ____________

2. What other Title I Teacher Training Programs do you attend? ____________

____

Form5

WORKSHOP PERSONNEL INVENTORY

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION EVALUATION SHEET

Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title I Art.

Teacher Training Session for Non-Public School Personnel
New York City School of Art and Design, 4 - 7 p.m., May 25, 1966

TEACHER NAME______________________________

SCHOOL NAME______________________________

SCHOOL ADDRESS______________________________TELEPHONE__________

TEACHER'S HOME ADDRESS______________________

TELEPHONE__________________

1. What grade level do you normally teach?_________________________

2. Do you usually teach art in your classroom?_____________________

3. What media do you have available in the classroom?_______________

____

4. Do you have the services of an art supervisor or an art specialist in your school?____

5. If you do teach art in your classroom, do you feel that the art program is adequately supported?_________________________________

.....adequately funded?______________________________________

6. Within your school, if you teach art, how many hours per month are devoted to art classes?_____________

7. Within your school is there an organized art program?

K - 3___________________________________

4 - 6___________________________________

other___________________________________

8. Within your school, are any art services offered after school hours?______

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION EVALUATION SHEET

9. Do you feel comfortable teaching art in your classroom?________________

   (please explain)____

   ____

10. Is there a particular area of art that you would like to know more about?____

11. Do you yourself participate in any sort of art activity outside of your school?____________________

12. How much, if any, training have you had in art education?

    none__________

    some__________

    advanced training (please list)

    ____

13. In terms of children's art, which of the following art program objectives do you personally consider most needed?

    A. Promotion of children's art appreciation____________
    B. Development of children's visual perception__________
    C. Development of children's art skills?_______________
    D. Promotion of independent thinking through art?_______
    E. Promotion of children's knowledge about art or artists?_________

14. Do you have any comments?____

____

____

____

Form 6

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

Demonstration Teacher Training Speech Program (non-public)

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Teacher's Name ______________________________

School ______________________________

Borough ______________________________

1. What workshops have you attended in the following areas: (Just give total number and the date as you recall same)

   ART ______________________________

   MUSIC ______________________________

   PHYS. ED. ______________________________

   LIBRARY ______________________________

   SPEECH ______________________________

2. In your own school, how many children do you teach each week? __________

3. Comments on this workshop: ______________________________

Form 7

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

TEACHER TRAINING AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECT
Non-Public Schools, TITLE I

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Subject area of this workshop ______________________ Date ____________

Your name ______________________________________

Your home address ____

______________________________________ Telephone ______________

School at which you teach ______________________________________

Address of school ____

Your position and/or grade(s) taught _______________________________

Average number of children in your class(es) ________________________

Previous training in this ares:

None ________________________

Some (specify) ________________________

Advanced (specify) ________________________

Other training programs currently attended _________________________

____

Form 8

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

Demonstration Teacher Training Speech Program (non-public)

GUIDELINES FOR REPORT AND EVALUATION OF TEACHER-TRAINING SESSIONS IN ART

1. Attendance
2. Organizational procedure
3. Specific Activities involved:
   A. ________ Time Spent ________
   B. ________ Time Spent ________
   C. ________ Time Spent ________
4. Numbers and names of specialists involved.
5. Key areas of emphasis in workshop.
6. Quality of Visual Presentations.
7. Communication skill of Board of Education representatives.
8. Depth of involvement and intensity of presentation of the participants.
9. Are physical facilities adequate to number of participants and type of experiences?
10. Were the demonstrations offered appropriate to the elementary school?
11. Materials for workshop ample?
12. Appropriateness of workshop topic.
13. Distinction of approach by grade level.
14. Is individuality of elementary children's art stressed?
15. Are participants dealt with as individuals?
16. Which categories of the proposal objectives were covered?
17. Descriptive comments organized by time interval with slide references.

Form 9

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

Demonstration Teacher Training Speech Program (non-public)

EVALUATIONS OF SESSIONS (Teacher Training)

RATING SCALE: (1) not at all (2) somewhat (3) moderately (4) well (5) very well

I. To what extent did the session you observed implement each of the objectives stated in the project description in relation to teacher training?

a. an organized, sequential program of direct instruction in the skills of listening and speaking for all pupils. ____________

b. the development of pupil ability to use listening and speaking skills effectively in practical situations. ____________

c. the provision of experiences for children in speech arts, in group discussions and oral reporting so as to further their self-expression and cultural enrichment. ____________

II. To what extent did the content of the session seem to contribute to solving classroom problems? ____________

III. To what extent did the session seem to help meet the interests of disadvantaged children? ____________

IV. To what extent did the session deal with the "far-reaching problems" of disadvantaged children? ____________

V. To what extent did the session contribute "innovations in content" and "additional teaching skills"? ____________

VI. To what extent did the session contribute to the development of teacher training in speech for disadvantaged children? ____________

VII. The quality of teaching improvement expected to result ____________

Form 10

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

Demonstration Teacher Training Speech Program (non-public)

Speech Improvement Program

BRIEF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Name: ______________________________

2. School: ______________________________

3. What do you teach? ______________________________

    a. H.S. ______________________________

    b. J.H.S. ______________________________

    c. Grade ______________________________

4. In your school, is there on your staff someone who could teach

    ______________________________? yes?______ no?______

    a. Teach Speech Arts: yes?______ no?______

    b. Teach Speech Improvement: yes?______ no?______

    c. Teach Speech Correction: yes?______ no?______

5. How many previous sessions have you attended? ______________

6. As a teacher, what benefits did you derive from the Workshop?

7. In what way did (or did not) the Workshop Sessions help you in dealing with the far-reaching problems of the disadvantaged child?